THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Dean of Winchester, The Deanery, Winchester, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXVII AUGUST, 1933 No. 158

EDITORIAL

To many minds there seems of recent years to have come a lull in the activities of those who are working for the reunion of Christendom. The decade from 1920 to 1930 was a time of high hopes, raised by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and sustained by the conferences at Stockholm and Lausanne in 1925 and 1927. But since the Lambeth Conference of 1930 the world has heard less of what is going on, and begins to wonder whether the same paralysis which has fallen upon so much of our common life since the economic crisis has not infected also the reunion movement.

The movement has, of course, been affected by the economic crisis. All such movements cost money, and those who make plans for their development have to cut their coats according to the cloth available. But to be affected financially is not the same thing as to be infected spiritually, and there is good reason to think that an alternative explanation may better account for the apparent quiescence. If the decade which began with the Lambeth Conference of 1920 was God's time for kindling our enthusiasm by the vision of the goal, that beginning with the Conference of 1930 may be bringing His call to us to see more clearly the obstacles which lie in the way, and to set ourselves more doggedly to overcome them. The way to reunion is more like a long-distance race than a hundred-yards sprint; those who are taking part in it are engaged in getting their second wind and settling down to the long grind; there is an inevitable lull in the excitement of most of the spectators. They have seen a certain number of runners fall out in the race, and turn to conversation among themselves. But some have provided themselves with field-glasses, and through them are watching what is going on in the far corner of the field; they see a much larger number running than the others are aware of; and among

them five groups who are running as teams. Moreover, they see these teams regarding one another, not as competitive rivals in a race but as partners in a common quest.

It was inevitable that in the decade of kindling enthusiasm different movements should arise independently to undertake different pieces of work which needed to be done. Two—the International Missionary Council, and the World's Student Christian Federation—came into being to establish friendly relations between Christians already engaged in certain particular activities which transcended national boundaries. Two—the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, and the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work—were founded for the application of common Christian principles to the practical problems of mankind. The fifth—the World Conference on Faith and Order—has as its aim to discover what measure of agreement as to those common Christian principles can be arrived at and officially endorsed by the various organized Churches of Christendom. It is clear that the needs which each arose to meet are real needs, and that the tasks of all are far from being completed. It is clear that the independence of each movement must be preserved, in order that the work for which it is adapted by its constitution and experience may be performed. But anyone who wishes to gain a synoptic view of what is going on in "The Reunion Movement" as a whole must envisage a movement which at least includes these five bodies, each of which is carrying on its own work in the most friendly spirit of co-operation with the rest.

So much it was necessary to write in order to introduce a most valuable book which has recently been published: *Le Catholicisme Non-Romain*, by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft.* The author is a native of Holland, a member of the Reformed Church, and an official of the World's Student Christian Federation. His book both helps to explain the apparent slowing up of the movement towards reunion, and gives good ground for hope of its steady progress in the future. He is writing in the first instance for the information of continental Protestants, to open their eyes to the significance of non-Roman Catholicism as "one of the most important factors in the religious situation of today, which is as yet insufficiently known." Anglicanism, Orthodoxy, and Old Catholicism present "a type of Christianity

* Paris, Bureau de Foi et Vie, 139, Boulevard Montparnasse, 10 frs.

with a distinct consciousness of its own, which is quite different from the expressions of the spiritual life known to Western Europe." If ignorance of this factor is as widespread as Dr. Visser 't Hooft holds it to be, it goes a long way towards explaining how it was that schemes of reunion based on a bare contrast of Protestantism with Roman Catholicism were doomed to disappointment. If his book is symptomatic of a genuine growth in mutual understanding among Christians of different traditions, it gives the best possible hope for future progress.

The first chapter is on "The Catholicism of the English Church." "Anglicanism," we read, "is becoming in reality a *via media* between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. A century ago Newman wrote: 'Protestantism and Popery are real religions . . . but the *via media*, viewed as an integral system, has scarcely had existence except on paper.' Today this dream has become a fact." And then:

> "If those who are setting themselves to construct the Church of England of the future succeed in the incarnation of their vision, there will appear an English Catholicism in which all the elements represented by each of its groups or parties will have their place, held together in a unique synthesis such as the Christian world has never known before.
>
> "What are the characteristic traits of this large Catholicism of the Church of England? How does it reveal itself in practice? . . . Its conception of the Church and of its tradition, its desire for unity and reunion, the significance it attaches to the sacraments, its practice of the religious life, its interest in social questions, and the theological principle on which the whole system is founded."

There follows a brief analysis of each point. On the last Dr. Visser 't Hooft writes: "It is a theology of the Incarnation which is at the centre of the faith of this Church. . . . The Incarnation is not merely a fact of past history which happened once for all, it is rather a principle which must be applied to the whole of life."

The second chapter describes "The Catholicism of the Orthodox Churches," and to many of us Anglicans this chapter will be as illuminating as we hope the first will be to continental Protestants. There is a brief survey of the history of these Churches, and of their constitution as a group of autocephalous bodies. But here, as elsewhere, Dr. Visser 't Hooft is not chiefly interested in matters of organization. He is trying to draw out the characteristic *ethos* of Orthodoxy. He points out that in Orthodoxy it is pre-eminently true that *lex orandi est lex credendi*, and says: "One reason which makes it so easy

to misunderstand Orthodoxy is that a large part of its life has never found self-expression in formulated statements. It has none of that self-consciousness, with its perpetual self-analysis and self-criticism, which is characteristic of Western Christianity." Whilst the chief stress of Orthodox theology lies in its emphasis on the abiding truth of the Resurrection, Orthodoxy, no less than Anglicanism, is rooted in the theology of the Incarnation: "Every time that God comes into the world through the Church He raises humanity to Himself, and clothes it with His own virtues. Nature itself can participate in the Divine glory. There is no absolute dualism between God and the world, between God and man. The gulf which separates them has been abolished by the Incarnation, and in the Church the Incarnation is perpetuated." The Orthodox conception of authority is explained by a careful exposition of the Russian conception of *sobornost*, and a real point of difference with Anglicanism is found in the conviction that "since a large portion of the truth has been revealed to the Church by the Holy Spirit, it can neither be found in the Scriptures, *nor proved by them*." (Italics mine.)

The third chapter opens with a brief account of the Old Catholics, and then discusses "The Œcumenical Significance of non-Roman Catholicism." The fourth and last is concerned with "The Questions at Issue between non-Roman Catholicism and Protestantism." Dr. Visser 't Hooft exposes some widespread misunderstandings of each by the other, selecting for treatment three on either side. Then follow four questions raised by non-Roman Catholicism for Protestants to consider, and three the other way round:

A. (1) Do Protestants take seriously enough the New Testament teaching on the visible Church ?
   (2) Do Protestants attach sufficient importance to the common stream of Christian tradition ?
   (3) Do Protestants really desire an organically united, visible Church—a *Una Sancta* ?
   (4) Do Protestants regard sacraments as "generally necessary to salvation" or as "optional additions" to the general practice of Christianity ?

B. (1) Do Catholics realize all that is implied by faith in the sovereignty and holiness of God ?
   (2) Is the Catholic "Incarnation Theology" with its corollary of the possible "divinization of man" consistent with the Biblical conception of the relation between God and man ?
   (3) Does this Catholic theology give its proper place to the Cross ?

The reality of the differences between Protestantism and non-Roman Catholicism is not minimized, the difficulty of finding a way of reconciliation is fully emphasized. Nevertheless, the final note is one of hope for the future:

"Finally, and above all, we must go on with our œcumenical discussions for the one supreme reason that God calls us to them. The question of results, immediate or ultimate, gives way before the realization that this work is a simple act of obedience. We do not make unity; it is God's gift. That is why our task does not depend on pragmatic reckonings. It can depend on nothing but our faith: faith that if God calls us to this task of preparing the way for His *Una Sancta*, He will make the day of its accomplishment dawn as He wills, in the time of His own choice."

This is a short book, but of an importance out of all proportion to its size.

L. H.

NOTE.—The Editor will be away from Winchester for a month from August 3rd, and particularly requests to be spared correspondence as much as possible during that time. Articles submitted for publication should not be sent before September 4th, as they will not be forwarded.

ARE THE GOSPEL NATIVITY STORIES LEGENDARY?

I

A GROUP of German New Testament scholars, of whom Dr. R. Bultmann* may be taken as representative, has for some time been returning an affirmative answer to this question. The idea has grown familiar in less radical circles, and ceases to excite surprise. But the word "legendary" is misused, even by scholars, with the disastrous result that the wider public is apt to think that legendary, unhistorical, and valueless are not far from being synonymous. The first step, therefore, is to claim for "legendary" its true meaning, and the second will be to show that in that sense the Nativity stories are not legendary.

If this be achieved, they will not have been proved historical. On the contrary, the difficulty of the problem which they present will only have been exposed. But we shall have disposed of that possibility which presents the greatest difficulty for Christian faith.

What then is the true meaning of legendary?

Pure legend, according to Monsignore Lanzoni,† is a fanciful tale in a local or temporal setting, told as history, or about a person, time, or place belonging to history, which has in fact no real relation with them other than that the historical and real supplies the background, excuse, or occasion for the telling. If in this definition we substitute "imperfect relation" for "no real relation" we have a definition of historical as opposed to pure legend.‡ Now the serious thing is the contention of these critics that the Nativity stories are not "historical" but "pure" legend.

Historical legend, as Lanzoni shows with a wealth of illustration, crops up in all types of society, and even as touching things which have only just occurred. It is the fruit of misapprehension and false conjecture on the one hand, and the general proneness to accept what is repeated on the other. It can hardly be questioned that it occurred in the primitive Church. The original eyewitness stories about the Lord were bound to wear down into paradigms, in the process of *didaska-*

* See his *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (2nd edit., 1931), and for less radical views, Père Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon S. Matthieu* (1923), p. 40, and Dr. Levertoff in the *New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (S.P.C.K.), Pt. III., p. 132.

† See his *Genesi, Svolgimento e Tramonto delle Leggende storiche* (1925), p. 2 (tom. xlviii. of *Studi e Testi*).

‡ Historical legend is hardly to be differentiated from "mangled" history, except that the "mangling" is done by a group and not an individual.

lia, until the eyewitness might have been puzzled to identify them. There would certainly be confusion of details, unconscious combination with elements from extraneous sources, and majoration of features that appealed to the community as a whole.

But it is a different matter with pure legend, which depends for its rise upon the presence of certain definite social and cultural conditions—namely, those that belong to the life of a large body of settled but illiterate peasantry for whom the story is a chief medium of literary education. The life of such folk is very hard and the range of their experience narrow, so that the notions which they entertain upon subjects outside their own working life are slight and fanciful, and their ideas about historical personages and events are naive and uncritical in the extreme. Further, their stories serve a recreational purpose in their lives, and so, even when serving also a religious or patriotic end, lean towards whatever arouses curiosity, excites sentiment, or strikes the fancy in any way.

Such legend is anonymous, the work, as Père Delehaye* puts it, of that abstraction which we call the genius of the people. Nevertheless it depends, really, upon the work of a number of humble artists, located perhaps within a certain class. Thus, for example, the vast manufacture of hagiographic legend in the Middle Ages was due chiefly to the lower clergy. And it is probable that whenever there has been prolific output of legend, some such class of creative agent has been at work. Without such aid, peasantry seems to be able to keep in almost indefinite currency a stock of legend it has once possessed. But deterioration takes place in the sense that poetical character is lost, names and details are endlessly confused, and there remains finally nothing but the vague association of a legendary personage with some set of circumstances.†

Pure legend being what it is, its appearance in a historical document is of great import. The old-fashioned course of excising the passages that were thought to be legendary, and trusting to make a coherent story of the rest, is wholly unsatisfactory. The very presence of legendary passages betrays something about the source as a whole, for it reveals the presence behind it of a certain social stratum through which some of the tradition has had to come.

If, then, there is anything in the Gospel Nativity stories that can rightly be identified as legend, we have to ask in what

* *Légendes hagiographiques* (1906), p. 5.

† I owe to my colleague, Mr. N. G. L. Hammond, an example. Allusion is prevalent, among modern Greek peasants, to a One-breasted Woman, in topographical connections, but with no coherent story. He holds it to be all that remains of the legend of the Amazons.

soil it can have germinated. Drews* carried the legendary hypothesis to extremes, and suggested that the Nativity stories are adaptations of a pre-Christian sun-myth. There might have been something to say for it had the Gospels arisen in the wake of a mass-conversion of peasantry. But the real circumstances appear to have been very different. Scripture evidence shows us small congregations recruited under the severest conditions, and subject to discipline and visitation. The New Testament writings themselves bespeak lively and critical intelligence in the authors, together with a quite singular appreciation of the place of historic fact in the grounding of religious belief. And the people who could be served by such writings, however we emphasize their lowly station in society, must have been infinitely more alive, mentally, than the "folk" with whom legend is formed. Each Church-member, though unlettered, was at school in the Church. His Christian profession severed him from his old life and cut across his old ideas. It left him in no temptation to share religious ideas with his heathen neighbours. In short, if we may trust the evidence of the New Testament at all, the primitive Church was, as a social structure, totally unsuited to the development of legend.

It has been suggested, however, that the Christian communities might have been influenced by floating Jewish legend, and the suggestion is the more plausible if it appears that the earliest apostolic Churches were in contact with Jewish congregations originating from the preaching of St. John Baptist. Upon such a presupposition rests, for example, Gressmann's theory† that the story of the shepherds is a Christian reconciliation of the known fact that Jesus grew up in the home of Joseph with a Jewish legend of a foundling Messiah. But even if the literary arguments upon which the theory rests were stronger, they require the support of further unsupported hypotheses—namely, that there existed a legend of the infant Messiah being discovered by shepherds lying in a manger, and that Christians were avid to catch up any Messiah-legend and apply it to Jesus. It seems to have been a constant weakness of the *Formgeschichtlicher* to theorize faster than they could follow up the implications of their theories. The case for the legendary origin of the Nativity stories is, in short, too weak to stand. On the other hand, the case for their full historicity is, to say the least, difficult and complicated. On considerations of form they lie under suspicion, and this is the next point to be considered.

The Synoptic Gospels, as touching their *ensemble*, do not

* *Christusmythe* (1910), pp. 52-88. † See Bultmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 323-4.

conform to one literary type. That of St. Mark is "Adventure-story," while that of the other two is "Bios-kai-epitedeuma." The "adventure" of St. Mark is the tragic-heroic adventure of the first Evangel, that of the Kingdom of God at hand. The story begins where the adventure begins, and ends where it ends, on the threshold of the second Evangel, that of the Resurrection. The literary transformation is effected in the other synoptic Gospels by incorporating a large body of teaching with the Marcan story, and prefixing a "birth and childhood" section made up of the stories with which we are concerned.

In literature of "Bios" form, the opening section has a notoriously bad name, and naturally so.* For, by the time that a "Bios" comes to be undertaken, the material for the opening section is mostly lost. And there is no reason for postulating any different situation in the case of the First and Third Gospels. It may be presumed that the writers obtained the Nativity stories only with difficulty.

Under such conditions an author has two possibilities before him. He may be content to work up his meagre information, or he may draw upon material of an equivocal character. St. Luke appears to exemplify the first and St. Matthew the second of these two courses.

The working up of scanty material is valuable according as the writer has understanding of the authentic character of the circumstances involved. In this respect St. Luke gives a very clear and positive impression, and the present writer cannot bring himself to share the low opinion which some German writers hold of the Lucan stories. They seem full of artistry—so much so, indeed, as to take away all hope that we can get behind them by means of the critical methods which have proved successful with more naive forms of literary construction. St. Luke recognizes explicitly his responsibilities and need of critical judgment, which he appears, in fact, to possess in marked degree. We know him to have had opportunities during his residence at Cæsarea, and we can observe the effectiveness of his completed work. The linking up of the lives of Christ and the Baptist; the bringing into relation of Nazareth, Bethlehem, and Jerusalem; and the beautiful delineation of the piety of those who "looked for the consolation of Israel" are real achievements. We have for a standard of comparison Gregory Nyssen's *Life of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus*,† a "Bios" by a writer of powers comparable with those of St. Luke, who also collected his material on the spot, *but* after a period of legend-development.

* H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, *Growth of Literature*, vol. i. (1932), p. 220.

† Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, tom. xlvi.

The success of St. Luke is enhanced by the comparison, while the reader is made to feel how poor material for an artist to work upon is raw legend. Little can be done with it except to string it together like beads on a necklace. Making all allowance for workmanship, St. Luke's material must have been of a different quality from this. It is no argument to the contrary if the supernatural enters into the Lucan stories in ways that resemble its appearance in legend. The casting out of demons by holy men is likewise a frequent theme in legend. But few now will contend that any story of exorcism betrays the entry of legend. St. Luke tells his stories of supernatural visitants with gusto, as one who understands about such things. Others, his contemporaries, took the same attitude. And there can be no doubt that they would have been ready to employ such forms of relation with regard to occurrences of which they were witnesses. It may be noted, also, that the expectancy which St. Luke attributes to the circle among whom Christ was born is not reflected in the manifold legends of the prophesied birth of heroes.

In St. Matthew the situation is different. The corresponding section contains the star-cycle. Its literary function is to accomplish, in a very elaborate fashion, what St. Luke attains very simply, namely to connect the birth at Bethelehem with the upbringing at Nazareth. In this task, the two Gospels move on entirely independent lines. With St. Luke it is by means of the census, which, if not simply historical, is very ingenious. St. Matthew knows nothing of inn or census; Joseph and Mary reside, for him, in Bethlehem, and he gets them to Nazareth by the following steps. Astrologers announce the birth of a hero-king; Herod, with the help of Jewish divines, locates the event; there follows the well-worn theme of vain attempts to frustrate destiny; prophecies are fulfilled and the Christ-child, in escaping, comes at last to rest in Nazareth. This cycle of stories is marked by symbolism rather than historical verisimilitude. On the one hand Herod has to play the part, strangely out of accord with facts, of "King of Israel after the flesh." And on the other, this very part is necessary to the poetic symbolism of the whole, a symbolism which is strangely enhanced when these stories are set in relation with the well-known star passage in Ignatius' *Epistle to the Ephesians*, xix.*

* "The virginity of Mary and her conceiving were hidden from the Ruler of this age, just as was also the death of the Lord; the three mysteries that were wrought in the silence of God to be shouted aloud. How then were they made known to the ages? A Star shone in heaven beyond all the stars, whose light was inexpressible, whose novelty amazed. All the rest of the stars, with sun and moon, were to this Star a choral train, while It was surpassing them all by Its light. There was perplexity among them to know whence this new appearance, so unlike them. There was being

This passage shows that Ignatius, who cites only the First Gospel, expects his readers to accept a symbolism with regard to the epiphany star which does not impose itself from the Matthæan text, yet is found to enhance the appropriateness of its detail. Following Ignatius, we see that the Magi are representatives of magic and star-ruled destiny, spokesmen of the iron law of the world-rulers and of dæmonic science. But there has appeared to them a star that is utterly new, and the age-long laws are abrogated. This star *is* Christ, and His epiphany is a downrush of God into His world. A catena of early Christian references to the star supports this reading of the tale and seems to show dependence rather on a tradition within which the text of St. Matthew and of Ignatius belong than upon that text alone.* Ignatius' star-passage is equivalent to a *credo*.† It was an urgent task to relate the Incarnation to ethnic ideas of divine epiphany, and this the passage does. We might alternatively call it a "Gnosis" with regard to the incarnation of the Son of God, provided that we acknowledge that his anti-docetic convictions sever Ignatius from Gnosticism properly so called. He is interpreting the past somewhat as apocalypse interprets the present, "in the Spirit," as the hyperbolic style suggests. Now if the Matthæan text is illuminated by such another passage, and therefore not wholly self-explanatory as it stands, we have reason for suggesting that, before the Evangelist used it in this quasi-historical setting, it was current with a different significance, and one more allied to that which has been attributed to the Ignatian passage. And this offers an explanation for the *abandon* with which, in St. Matthew, the original astrological cast is thrown over,‡ and the star is made to go before the Magi and stand above the house. If such a suggestion seems to make the Evangelist too little scrupulous in his methods of obtaining material with which to satisfy the demands of a literary convention, it is to be considered that the

---

dissolved also through It all power of magic and every spell, the evil cloud of unknowing was vanishing away and the ancient tyranny was being destroyed as God appeared in human form for the new dispensation of eternal life. So the thing that had been perfected by God long before had its inception, at which the whole world was moved because the dissolution of death was put in hand."

* There may be mentioned *Protevangelium*, xxi.; Clem. Alex., *Excerpta ex scriptis Theodoti*, lxxiv.; Ephrem Syrus, *Hymni in Fest. Epiph.* xiv.; Pseudo-Ephrem, *Cave of treasures*; Pseudo-Julius Africanus, *De rebus Persicis*; Athanasius, *De Inc.*, xxxvii.; Ambrose, *In Luc.*, ii. 45; Aug. *c. Faust.*, ii.; Prudentius, *Cathemerinon xii. in Epiph.*; Remigius of Auxerre, *Hom.* vii., and *Book of the Bee*, xxxviii. These passages tend to identify Christ with the star, to speak of the powers of the air as shaken as Christ came to earth, and to treat the star as an epiphany to the universe.

† *Cf.* the creed of Lucian, "We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son, King from King, True Light, the Way, First-born of all creation, Who in these last days of ours came down from above, born of a Virgin, and made Man."

‡ The astrological background of the story is well illustrated by Dr. J. K. Fotheringham in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. x. (1909), pp. 116-119.

first Christians, for all their insistence on the historic character of revelation, did not view historicity exactly as we do. For example, they accepted prophecy as proving the thing prophesied. St. Peter at Pentecost proves the incorruption of the Lord's Body, *teste David*.* And the Seer of Revelation equally shows its true inanition by words of Christ spoken in a vision,† saying, "I became carrion." It is not therefore so astonishing that the First Gospel should appear to have been provided with some of its matter for the section "Birth and childhood" by dint of incorporating a piece of Christological poesy, emanating perhaps from one of the famous prophets of Antioch, and already "canonical" in the community wherein the Gospel was composed.

To conclude: the gravity of the issue with which this article is concerned is due to the fact that if the Nativity stories could be proved legendary, there would no longer be place for assurance that we know what authentic Christianity is. But if they be not legendary, though they bear such an equivocal character as has been suggested for the star-cycle, yet is not the trustworthiness of the Gospels as a whole undermined.

W. TELFER.

THE ROUT OF THE MAGI

"THE Three Kings" in Matthew ii., according to the usual interpretation, symbolise the coming of the Gentile world to Christ, as the shepherds in Luke ii. represent the worship of the Jews; St. Matthew recounts the homage of "wise men," St. Luke that of the simple. The Old Testament affinities of the story are obvious. The star reminds us of Numbers xxiv. 17: "There shall come forth a star out of Jacob."‡ Psalm lxxii. 10, 11 tells of Kings and Gentiles bringing presents and worshipping the Messiah, and has thereby helped to turn the Magi into kings in Christian tradition. Isaiah lx. contributes the rising of the light and the coming of Gentiles and kings with gifts of gold and frankincense; the camels of Christian art are derived from *v.* 6. Scholars of irreproachable orthodoxy are content to dismiss the problem of the historical foundation of the story as insoluble, and to suggest that the passage may be Christian midrash, a homiletic compilation on a basis of Old Testament material.§

* Acts ii. 25-31. † Rev. ii. 18.

‡ *The Jewish Encyclopædia*, i. 86, quotes a story of a star at Abraham's birth.

§ See *A New Commentary, in loc.*

But justice is not done to the richness of this wonderful chapter unless the interpretation is governed throughout by the key-word Magi, which, such is the contention of the following pages, can only mean "magicians."

I

The Magians were originally a Median tribe, who, like the Levites in Israel, became the custodians of a religion, in their case Zarathustra's.* Moving westward, they absorbed Babylonian ideas of astrology and divination. Dio Chrysostom, soon after 100 A.D., speaks of them in high praise, as men capable of intercourse with God and knowing how to serve the divine Being, whom the common people through ignorance imagine to be sorcerers.† There were colonies of Magians in Asia Minor and Egypt; their movement was parallel to that of Mithraism.‡ Quite lately M. Cumont has shown that a famous myth recounted by Dio Chrysostom,§ in which the world is described as swinging round like a fourhorse chariot, is based on a Magian psalm in which Mithraic theology is mingled with astral elements of Babylonian origin.‖ The favourable estimate of the Magians is supported by Porphyry, Ammianus, and other writers.

In what sense are we to take the word Magi in St. Matthew? The grave beauty of the story inclines us to adopt the favourable sense, and to see Gentile religion at its best bowed before the feet of Christ.

The arguments on the other side are strong. St. Luke has two stories of Apostles confronted with Magi. Simon the Magian is overthrown by St. Peter at Samaria (Acts viii.), Elymas the Magian by St. Paul at Paphos (Acts xiii.); one is a Samaritan, the other a Jew. At Ephesus there is a mass-conversion of Jews and Greeks, including many magicians (the actual word is not used), who bring their books of incantations and burn them, at a cost to themselves of 50,000 pieces of silver. This is a signal triumph of the Gospel; "so mightily grew the word of the Lord and prevailed" (Acts xix. 17-20). It is reasonable to interpret St. Matthew's ambiguity in the light of St. Luke's undoubted meaning.

In the Apostolic Fathers the popular meaning alone is found. Magic (μαγεία) belongs to the Way of the Black One (Barnabas

* According to Messina, *Der Ursprung der Magier und die zarathustrische Religion* (quoted in *The Clergy Review*, Jan., 1933, p. 17), the word is derived from *maga*, "a gift"; they *received* Z.'s religion.

† *Or.* xxxvi.

‡ *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, art. "Magier."

§ *Loc. cit.*

‖ See Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, i. 282-4.

xx. 1; *cf. Didache* v. 1). "Thou shalt not deal in magic" ("be a mage," μαγεύσεις) is part of the expanded Decalogue in *Didache* ii. 2. In Hermas (*Mand.* xi. 2), "they come" to the false prophet "as to a mage" (ὡς ἐπὶ μάγον). But the determining passage is in Ignatius (*Eph.* xix. 3): "A star shone forth in the heaven above all the stars; and its light was unutterable, and its strangeness caused amazement; and all the rest of the constellations with the sun and moon formed themselves into a chorus about the star; but the star itself far outshone them all. . . . *From that time forward every sorcery and every spell was dissolved.*" If, as is generally held, St. Matthew is the Antiochian Gospel, we have here the earliest interpretation, an interpretation based on local tradition, of the "Wise Men" story. It is hard to resist the impression that for the writer of these words the story was poetic and symbolic truth rather than a prose record of historical fact.

There are some sixteen occurrences of "magi" and cognate words in the Apologists; in every case the meaning is magician, magic, etc. Artemis is a mage,* as Simon was,† and as opponents declared Jesus to be.‡ Justin Martyr explains the visit of the Magi in the same way as Ignatius. Discussing Isaiah viii. 4, "He shall take the power of Damascus and the spoils of Arabia," he says: "The Magi, who had been carried off as spoil *for all kinds of evil actions, which were wrought in them by that demon,* by coming and worshipping Christ are shown to have departed from that power which had taken them as spoil."§

II

We cannot even be sure that St. Matthew meant us to take the Magi as being Gentiles; he may have thought of them as magicians from the Jewish Dispersion in Babylonia—why should Gentiles be interested in the Messiah? For centuries past the Jews had been in contact with Magianism. As long ago as 591 B.C., so we learn from Ezekiel, there were Magian proselytes at Jerusalem, who "put the branch to their nose" (the *barsom*, still used by Parsis, lest they should corrupt the fire with their breath).‖ "Rab-mag" (the chief Magian apparently) was among Nebuchadrezzar's officials at the siege of Jerusalem.¶ Tobit, a novel of the Babylonian Dispersion, is full of demonology and magic. A startling, though familiar,

* Tatian, *Or.* viii. 2. † Justin, *Apol.* xxvi. 2.
‡ Justin, *Dial.* lxix. 7.
§ *Dial.* lxxviii. 9. Iren. III. xvii. 4 quotes the same passage of Isaiah in connection with the Magi.
‖ Ezek. viii. 17. This, the usual, explanation has been recently challenged.
¶ Jer. xxxix. 3, 13.

passage is Daniel v. 11, where we read that Daniel was made "master of the magicians."

At the time of Christ Judaism was deeply tinged with astrology and magic. The heavenly journeys of the Apocalyptists are astrological in origin. The Revelation of St. John lends itself to astrological explanation.* Perhaps the teaching of the prophets about destiny and God's will paved the way to acceptance of astrological fatalism. The veil of the Temple was embroidered with stars, so Josephus tells us.† The signs of the zodiac are depicted in Jewish catacombs at Rome and in two recently excavated Palestinian synagogues.‡

This is enough to show that magic and star-worship were enemies inside the camp, so that, even if St. Matthew thought of the Wise Men as Gentiles, this is not the point of his story.

If the Jews were addicted to such practices, they were only following the fashion of the age. Determinism infected all classes as astrology spread like a flood over the lands surrounding the Mediterranean and Babylonian conceptions entered into the working religion of the masses. The planets were thought of as presiding over the lives of men, the days of the week, planets, metals, etc. (To this day we speak of men as mercurial, votaries of Venus, martial, jovial, or saturnine, and *Old Moore's Almanack* commands a ready sale.)§ The nobler spirits, such as the great Stoics, bowed the head to fate with proud unconcern. But the masses desired rather to learn the secrets of the future and consulted pseudo-scientific practitioners. The wish was father to the thought; somehow or other there must be a way round and the decrees of fate could be avoided, if only one knew how. The connection of earthly objects with the planets being purely arbitrary, science yielded to superstition and the spells of the magician were employed to deflect fate to one's private ends.

III

We must now look at magic more closely, drawing on the rich store of material provided by K. Preisendanz in his Corpus of Magical Papyri.‖ The greater part of the book is occupied by the Great Paris Papyrus, which in the original has 3275

* As by Boll so brilliantly.

† *B.J.* V. 214. Note that this veil was rent at the death of Christ, so that the stars were affected, as at His birth.

‡ G. Kittel, *Die Religionsgeschichte und das Ur-Christentum*, p. 61.

§ "Ten years ago the total circulation was some 260,000; now more than 1,000,000 copies—many more—are sold every year." (Foreword to Blakemore's edition of *Old Moore's Almanack* for 1933.)

‖ *Papyri Græcæ Magicæ: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*, vol. i. (1928). A second volume, which appeared later, has not been used.

lines. The documents afford difficult but fascinating reading, and introduce us into an almost incredibly fantastic world where dreams come true. We cannot discuss here the problems of abnormal psychology suggested when we realise that the magicians took their craft seriously and were often genuinely religious. Hysteria, auto-suggestion, dissociated personality, the objectifying in waking life of dream experiences—each of these provides clues to interpret this or that difficult passage.

The Egyptian magicians incorporated many Jewish phrases in their charms, Iao (Jehovah), for instance, being often employed. This is what we should expect in a largely Jewish city like Alexandria, the probable original home of the manuscript. But the material is mainly native Egyptian, though the invocations are addressed to Greek and Oriental divinities as well as to the gods of the country. "A tried receipt of Pibeches for demoniacs" (pp. 170-2) includes "I adjure thee by Jesus the god of the Hebrews,"* and "by the great god Sabaoth, thanks to whom the river Jordan receded and the Red Sea, through which Israel travelled, became fordable." This incantation, which concludes with the words: "This charm is Hebraic and preserved among pure men," seems to be exceptional.

A good many incantations are addressed to stars, for example the Great Bear. The god, an angel, a familiar spirit, a star, seem to be interchangeable terms. We are reminded of Rev. i. 20: "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches." In one place the magician offers incense and myrrh and prays to his familiar spirit. "And this shall be the sign for thee: A shining star shall descend and place itself in the midst of the chamber and when the star has descended before thine eyes thou shalt see the angel, whom thou hast invoked, and immediately shalt thou know the counsels of the gods" (p. 6). A little later we read: "Use this incantation, for what purpose thou wilt. And when three hours have passed, immediately the god will spring away. Then bid the boy run to the door and say: 'Go, Lord, blessed god, to where thou art eternally.' And the god disappears" (p. 8).

The two almost invariable accompaniments of the incantations are incense and myrrh. Incense is the foundation of the various mixtures which are offered, such as "eye of wolf, styrax, cummin, bdella, and other costly spices" (p. 16). All charms are written with myrrh-ink; thus a receipt for ink is given:

* These papyri cannot be dated. But an Egyptian magician in the first century might well have used this charm, impressed by a report of one who cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils and anxious to neglect no chance.

"myrrh, cinquefoil and artemisia" (p. 22). In one passage the familiar spirit brings gold (p. 8).

Here we must break off, though the line of thought suggested by "Take a cat" (and put various things in its mouth, p. 34) is alluring.

IV

From this evidence I conclude that some at least of the original readers of the First Gospel would understand Matthew ii. in the following sense.

Magi in Babylonia—Jews, for they were expecting the Messiah—saw a star rise. It was a planet, reappearing after an absence, which on the strength of magical books or their own calculations they connected with the birth of the Messiah. They journeyed to Jerusalem, where they enquired further. They went on to Bethlehem, the star, or angel, guiding them until it *literally* stood over where the young child was, in the manner of the star which entered the chamber of the Egyptian magician. They opened their caskets and offered the instruments of their trade, incense and myrrh; also the gold which they had amassed as privileged possessors of knowledge greatly prized.

They would take the story to be St. Matthew's equivalent of St. Luke's narratives in Acts viii, xiii., and xix. It is instructive to notice that in our interpretation of the star we have returned to the kind of explanation found in pre-critical commentaries, and much learned discussion of astronomical phenomena, conjunctions and the like, has become irrelevant.

V

If the interpretation given above stands, it becomes a matter of little importance whether or not there was an actual historical event behind the story of the Wise Men. Personally I should be inclined to leave it an open question, though leaning on the whole to the view that St. Matthew, or rather the tradition he used, summarised in this symbolical manner the triumphs over the Magians won by the risen Christ and fittingly put the story at the beginning of his Gospel.

To some the conclusion may be painful. You have robbed me of a text for missionary sermons, says one. Yes, but practically the whole Bible is left to provide missionary themes and motives. You have introduced a myth into a region of sacred and tender associations, says another. Perhaps so; but what do we mean by myth in this connexion? Not that St. Matthew, or a Christian preacher before him, on the basis

of hints in the Old Testament composed an edifying tale; rather that a hint dropped by one was picked up by another, passed round at the Christian assembly, meditated upon at home, until at last all unworthy elements were purged away and a folk-tale emerged which St. Matthew incorporated in his Gospel. The Three Kings story is one of the most exquisite things in all literature. Art, poetry, pageant and devotion have offered their tributes to it. Only if we confine our conception of inspiration to prose shall we dare to say that this masterpiece of poetic symbolism was not inspired by the Holy Ghost.

Further, in God's deep purpose it comes to us today charged with new significance, written for our learning. The struggle between the Church and determinism, so acute in the first century, is again with us. In the Apostolic Age the question was put: Do you believe in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? or does God mean for you an inexorable fate, which nevertheless you hope to dodge, if only you can learn the secret? For one noble Stoic accepting the decrees of fate there were hundreds who tried to read the future in order to avoid it, or to profit by it. What the Stoics called Destiny appeared to the masses as Luck. So it is today. For every one austere scientific determinist working in a laboratory there are tens of thousands of men and women who believe in luck, in a capricious universe where anything may happen. Loss of faith in the Father revealed by Jesus Christ is the main cause of the immense vogue of gambling, which is accompanied by a pathetic faith in the value of tips, systems, and the like. The bookmakers and the tipsters are the priests of the cult in its contemporary form; gold flows to the proprietors of these "curious books."

To complete the parallel, the enemy has found a footing within the camp and the veil of the temple is still studded with stars. The Roman Catholic Church with its continuing witness to supernatural religion, its burning devotion and tireless good works, yet condones and even fosters the gambling spirit. Dublin gives us the Eucharistic Congress and the Sweeps.

The issue is plainly set before us by the Paris Papyrus in a passage which might be cited as a classic illustration of the fallacy of illustrating the New Testament from Gentile sources without giving the context.

Our Lord said: "Ask, and it shall be given you" (*αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν*, Matt. vii. 7); the Papyrus says: "Ask God what thou wilt, and He shall give it thee" (*αἰτοῦ, ὃ βούλει, τὸν θεόν, καὶ δώσει σοι*, p. 98). Yes, but Jesus based His promise on the love and wisdom of the heavenly Father;

the magician's words in full are: "*A stronger charm than this I have found nowhere in the world.* Ask God what thou wilt and He shall give it thee."

VI

So few readers will have time or inclination to study Preisendanz's great work that I venture to add some illustrations of New Testament passages.

1. John iii. 3-8: "Except a man be born again. . . . Except a man be born of water and the spirit. . . . The spirit bloweth where it listeth."

Preisendanz, p. 90: "If it seem good to you to deliver me up again for a birth unto immortality . . . that after the present grievous trouble I may see the immortal beginning with immortal spirit, with immortal water, with indestructible air . . . that I may be born again in mind (*νοήματι*) and that the holy spirit may breathe in me."

2. John i. 51: "Ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man" (*ὄψεσθε . . . τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*).

Preisendanz, p. 90: "Thou shalt see in that day and in that hour a divine constellation: the gods as they circle round the pole ascending to heaven and others descending" (*ὄψῃ . . . τοὺς πολεύοντας ἀναβαίνοντας εἰς οὐρανὸν θεοὺς, ἄλλους δὲ καταβαίνοντας*).

Recalling the equivalence in the magical papyri of stars, gods and angels, we must reckon with the possibility that a converted Magian would have interpreted John i. 51 in an astrological sense—the stars circling round the Son of Man. Apart from the help of Gen. xxviii. 12, which suggests that the Son of Man is now, so to speak, the ladder, John i. 51 would seem to need such an explanation.

3. 1 Timothy ii. 4: "who willeth that all men should be saved."

Preisendanz, p. 112: "Save me, for thou ever rejoicest in saving thine own."

4. Rev. xxi. 6: "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end" (*ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τό τέλος*); Rom. xi. 36: "Of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things."

Preisendanz, p. 162: "Beginning and ending (*ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος*) art thou (*i.e.* Selene) . . . for of thee are all things and in thee . . . all things end."

NOTE.—A. D. Nock's exhaustive Essay on "Paul and the Magus" in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, v. 164-188 (1933), is the fullest accessible

treatment of the subject. In the light of it my theory may seem an undue simplification of a complicated problem. However, I see no reason to alter my article, which was written before Volume V. of *Beginnings* was available. I still think that star-worship on the part of Jews is St. Matthew's primary meaning. That the idea would have been congenial to St. Luke is shown by Acts vii. 42: "God gave them up to serve the host of heaven" —St. Stephen's historical allusions throughout his speech are chosen with a view to the immediate situation.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE GOSPEL AND THE CHURCH*

"THY holy Church"—"thy holy Gospel." When we recite the Collect for St. Mark's day and read the appointed Epistle (Eph. iv. 7 *seqq.*), we find these two ideas intimately associated. It is therefore not inappropriate that a paper read on St. Mark's day should deal with this conjunction of ideas, and especially in this year of grace when we shall be concerned with the centenary of the Oxford Movement and its reaffirmation of the importance of the Church. What is the relation between the Gospel and the Church? Has the Church a place in the Gospel, or is it merely an extraneous piece of mechanism, apt, as many would say, to impede rather than assist the free play of the Gospel? The question is of some moment in an age when religious individualism is widely taken to be almost axiomatic, and what von Hügel liked to call "church appurtenance" far from being accepted as necessary by multitudes who value the name of Christian and wish to guide their lives by the teaching of Jesus Christ. There is hardly anything more characteristic of the main orthodox tradition of Christianity than the emphasis it lays on the Church: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, the Divine Society which is the Ark of Salvation and the Mother of us all. There is in the Christian tradition a strong love and reverence for the Church, not conceived of as an ideal fellowship, purely invisible and spiritual, but as that actual historical Society, with its creeds, sacraments, and bishops, its liturgies and traditional methods of devotion, which despite its internal quarrels all can recognize by these marks, and which for nineteen centuries has stirred men and women to great love or to something like hate. But what is the justification for all this in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the wandering preacher of Nazareth?

Is its source Palestine or imperial Rome? Is it the authentic Gospel that supports us in seeking our Heavenly Father through

* A paper read to a Clerical Society in the Chichester diocese, St. Mark's day, 1933.

the historic Church? Is our union with Christ in the Church, which is His Body? Does the Holy Spirit, according to the principles set forth in the Gospel, work through the Church?

I do not think that these questions are unanswerable, and I am certain that both historically and religiously they are of immense importance. Before sketching the lines along which answers may be found, I would say that it is desirable to remember that nearly all Christians have an idea of the Church as in some sense connected with Jesus Christ, and that they value what they conceive the Church to be. The Catholic Christian, if he really understands his religious position, is to my mind in the happy state of being able to welcome every sincere and positive expression of Christian fellowship, and to respect every mode in which the union of believers in Christ has been realized. He must, indeed, regret what he is bound to regard as the inadequacy of the theories of the Church of Jesus Christ proposed by Protestantism; and he must also regret the sectarianism which has set up new ecclesiastical organizations over against the Apostolic order of the historic episcopal and credal Church. But, in default of full Catholic order, the good of every positive realization of the Church-idea can and must be recognized. The Catholic can respect and admire the Protestant societies as such—not merely the fruits of Christian living found in individuals within them; he can believe them to be quite genuine, though variously incomplete, expressions of what is better and more fully realized in the Catholic Church. For liberal Catholicism, as distinct from papal autocracy, Christian reunion is not another name for the mere disappearance of the Protestant societies. It is the integration of Christendom round certain principles of faith and order, some of which have been better guarded by Catholicism than by Protestantism, but all of which will gain in richness of content and vitality of operation from a true union of the two existing traditions of Christian life and thought. The Catholic approximation—so a Catholic believes—is nearest to the full truth of the Gospel; but he cannot, without sin, dismiss all other approximations as valueless. Here is no question of a simple clash between the simply right and the simply wrong, but of the variously incomplete gaining enrichment from each other's good things.

This being premised, we may return to our questions. A reasoned answer will be made more possible if we remind ourselves of what is frequently put forward as an alternative to that view of the Church which has already been briefly suggested.

This alternative is to regard the visible Church as at the most secondary to a message of individual salvation; as no part of the intention of the Jesus of history, but a later accre-

tion; as created by the natural drawing together of believers for mutual edification and common action; and as entirely unconcerned with the maintenance, by means of an Apostolic ministry, of any permanent and structural bond of union and continuity. On this view the Church and its ministry are natural human devices, fully explicable in terms of group psychology, comparable to what is found in any other association of men for the furtherance of a common purpose, often, no doubt, blessed and accepted by God, but not a Divine gift of a supernatural kind entrusted to man and descending from on high. They are not, on this view, a *part* of the God-revealed Gospel, but at best a convenient—and in the last resort a dispensable, almost an optional—corollary of the Gospel message. Such a view of the Church has greatly influenced Protestantism, though many Protestants, especially at the present time, would not be willing to commit themselves to the full acceptance of it.

Is this the view stated or implied in the New Testament? If it is, then orthodox Christians will have to admit the force of the criticism sometimes directed against them by those who dismiss their exalted conception of the Church as nothing but the pride of a long-lived corporation, glorifying itself.

We will seek to find our answer by going back to that great idea which dominates the Gospels, the idea of the Kingdom of God. The Gospels show us our Lord proclaiming the Gospel of the Kingdom, leading His Apostles to see in Him Christ the King, and dying for publicly claiming to be that Christ. What is this idea of the Kingdom which meant so much to Him? The answer must be sought in the historical background of His mission.

The idea was already old when our Lord came on earth. It is deeply rooted in the foundations of Hebrew religion. Israel had carried through all the stages of its religious development, from its primitive faith in a tribal god to its highest insights in the fully shaped ethical monotheism of great prophets, the conviction that God was in a special sense the God of Israel, and Israel the chosen people of God. This belief was in no way incompatible with the further belief that the God of Israel was the one true God of the whole world; and in the writings of the great unknown prophet of the Exile the two ideas produce the grand, and logically inevitable, corollary that Israel has a missionary obligation to the non-Jewish world. As trustee of a unique knowledge of God, Israel must see that it is too small a thing for God to be known aright only in His elect people, and that He is a light to lighten the Gentiles also. But the specially close relationship, sealed by covenant, between the one true God and His people Israel affects primarily the life of Israel

itself. It is to be embodied in the national and social order. Hence Israel is theocratic: God is in a special sense the King or Father of Israel. So we find that human Kingship in Israel is either suspect, as encroaching on the prerogative of God, or is thought of as viceregal, the king being but the vicar of God.

Yet this reign of God over His elect people is contradicted by plain facts. It is not fully realized at any time; and it is often actively defied by the social sins and idolatrous lapses of the people. The prophets, whose mission it is to stand for the full, sole sovereignty of Israel's Divine King, have continually to lament and denounce the backslidings of their countrymen. Theory and fact are at variance, and the prophet is at once the lyrist of the Divine goodness and the stern denouncer of moral failure and religious blindness. He had to adjust his conception of the reign of God to the facts of the national life: and this was done by representing the full reign of God as a great future blessing rather than as a present reality. The prophetic vision is now of "the day of the Lord" when God will vindicate Himself in fires of judgment, which only a remnant of faithful people will survive. With that "day of the Lord" the promised Kingdom will be fully established, and a golden age of peace and prosperity will reward the faithful servants of God. The anointed Viceroy of God will sit on the throne of his father David and will lead the Jewish nation to triumph. Jerusalem will be the queen of the world, and the kings of the nations will bring gifts to the one shrine of the true God.

Once more the actual failed to fulfil the ideal. Generation succeeded generation and the great prophetic line died out. Israel, looking out on the larger world around, and seeing herself as but an insignificant factor in the high politics of great kingdoms and empires, came to another revision of her national hopes. In the later writings of the "apocalyptic" type, the stage is vastly enlarged, and the reward of Israel is seen to depend on a Divine interposition far transcending the restoration of the golden age of King David. The apocalyptic writers see the coming of God's Kingdom in a universal cataclysm, wherein heaven and earth will pass away and a new order will be established by a stroke of Divine omnipotence. In some of these writings the triumph of God's elect and the vindication of Israel's Divine King will be ushered in by an Anointed One, who is far more than an earthly prince of David's line; he appears as a mysterious supernatural being, descending from heaven with unearthly terrors to destroy the enemies of Israel and establish the new order of things by superhuman power. Such seems to be the mysterious personage of the Book of Enoch.

It is not to be supposed that all these dreams were systematized in any precise form. What is called "the Messianic hope" was no ordered scheme of ideas, but rather a floating mass of deeply felt emotions, welling up in pictorial forms from the intense convictions of deeply religious men. The Jewish mind was passionately convinced of the reality and activity of God, and also of His invincible purpose for the Jewish race. It was not given to philosophic reflection and the logical analysis of ideas. The "hope of Israel" cannot be pinned down in any neat definition. But, broadly speaking, we may distinguish two forms of it: the prophetic vision of a Davidic King fulfilling the national aspirations of a repentant and purified Israel; and the apocalyptic vision of a universal catastrophe issuing in a reign of the saints, sometimes under the guidance of a supernatural Messiah. These lived on side by side, a shifting pageant of aspirations merging into each other and highly charged with emotional ardour. The splendid thought of a Divine Purpose in history is the supremely valuable thing here; and it persisted with unabated vigour because the heart of the Jew was gripped by it. An unsympathetic critic might be inclined to say "the heart at the expense of the head." Certainly this idea found symbolic expression in what may seem to many a farrago of heated fancies. Yet to be merely scornful of these "fancies" would be shallow and superficial. The exuberant symbolism bears witness to a genuinely popular and widespread acceptance of what is essentially a philosophical truth of the profoundest import—the immanence of the Eternal and Transcendent in the temporal process. The test of a genuine and vital belief in God is always its success in getting away from a merely abstract theology in which God does everything in general and nothing in particular. Jewish religion is nowhere more manifestly right than in its insistence that the living God must show Himself in the concrete and historical order. Its apocalyptic Messianism was often highly coloured and even crude in its symbolism; but it saved Jewish monotheism from the fatal paralysis that besets any religion in which God is banished from history into some intellectualist heaven of abstractions.

Into this world of ideas the Lord came. What did He make of them? Even if we leave aside all our Christian beliefs in the Providence of God and the *praeparatio evangelica*, and regard the matter purely from the human end, it is clear that to reject these ideas entirely would have been to make Himself unintelligible and to repudiate as valueless the whole religious experience of the Jewish people. He must build on what He found, even though there was much reconstruction to be done. Vital truths about God and man lay, half comprehended and

distorted, in these ideas. Once purged of their unworthy elements and reset in the light of His unerring intuitions, they gave Him the material He wanted for His work. The Gospels make clear both the continuity and the novelty of our Lord's message, in which the full truth of what had been dimly foreshadowed now at last found expression.

It is in the narrative of the Temptations that we get the statement of how our Lord worked out His own relation to the religious aspirations that centred in the idea of the Kingdom. His experiences during that time of retirement in the desert, and the conclusion He reached, govern the whole subsequent development of the Gospel story.

In the first place, He definitely identifies Himself with the hope of the Kingdom of God. But He rejects, as evil, the ideas that the Kingdom was to be won by political action, or that it is to be thought of as one of the kingdoms of this world, even the greatest. The Kingdom is no nationalist ambition, and has nothing to do with political revolution or military conquest. Equally He rejects the idea of its establishment by tremendous acts of crudely miraculous power. The Christ will not crush men into submission by dazzling feats, ostentatiously superhuman, overawing the crowd by theatrical displays of power. The Kingdom is spiritual: He will seek to establish it only by winning the allegiance of the heart to that heavenly Order where God's will is gladly obeyed. In the Lord's Prayer we are reminded that God's Kingdom exists in heaven, and bidden to pray that this full sovereignty may extend from the eternal and invisible world of God's unchanging life to the temporal world of men. The host of heaven find fullness of life in co-operation with the perfect will of God. Man's salvation, his perfect completeness and wholeness, depends upon his incorporation in that Eternal Order; and that is to find its embodiment here on earth.

It soon appears, as we read the Gospels, that this fundamental message of God's Kingdom is not left by our Lord as something wholly concerned with the future. Nor does its spirituality mean that the Kingdom on earth is simply invisible, working secretly in the hearts of individuals here and there, and finding no corporate embodiment. On the contrary: the supernatural Order is already here with the coming of the Christ, and it finds its expression in the "little flock" of Christ's disciples to whom it is "the Father's good pleasure" to give the Kingdom. There is a Messianic community gathered round the Messiah and created by Him; and in that society God's Kingdom on earth has begun to be. For that community the reign of evil powers has been ended by One who is stronger

than those powers: Satan has fallen as lightning from heaven. The works of mercy done by the Messiah and His forgiveness of sins are signs of the presence of the new order. Those who belong to that Kingdom are the salt of the earth, the leaven of the lump; they will purify the world and spread the supernatural Kingdom, though the Lord Himself in His earthly life is sent only to the lost sheep of Israel. The Twelve are chosen to share the Messiah's work, and to be trained as the leaders and servants of the Messianic community: to them is appointed a Kingdom, and they receive the promise, "ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." They are the princes of the New Israel, though they have to learn what true greatness in the supernatural Kingdom means—namely, the service of all after the example of the King Himself who came to minister, not to be ministered unto.

All this is the act of God. It neither is nor could be the work of man. God sent His Christ, and the Christ brought the Kingdom on earth into being. The Kingdom is composed of men, but it is not created by men at their own will. They receive it: they may enter violently into it, but it is there, by Divine will, for them to enter at all. Yet, though it is all of Grace and Divine favour, a gift of sheer love, those who seek to enter into the Kingdom cannot have it without effort on their part. To be a citizen of the Kingdom is a formidable thing. Because it is a pearl of great price, men must be ready to surrender everything for that citizenship. The moral demands are very high. Christ's followers must exceed the righteousness of the Old Law and of the scribes and Pharisees. They must strive after the perfection of God Himself, because they have entered into God's supernatural Order. The Sermon on the Mount is not a programme for the world apart from the Kingdom. It is the supernatural standard of a supernatural Order. The marriage bond, for example, in the Messianic community on earth, is not to be regarded from the point of view of those who, like Moses, had to compromise with the hardness of unredeemed hearts. It is to be conceived in terms of the Divine idea of a mystical union which is indissoluble. The New Age brings new powers, enabling men to live by new standards of conduct. The Messianic community lives in the supernatural Order: it is not of this world.

It is impossible for an unprejudiced reader of the Gospels to overlook that part of their content which we have been summarizing. We cannot make sense of the Gospels unless we give full weight to these considerations. And the impression they leave is one not easily evaded: a Divine Society, the supernatural Church here on earth, beginning in the "little flock" that

gathered round the Messiah, is at the very heart of the historic Gospel of Jesus Christ. Nothing can be more evangelical than that. Here is nothing that is man-made, nothing that is a corollary of a Gospel addressed to the individual alone, but a Holy Church into which we enter by the very fact of coming to Christ—a Divine Creation and a Divine gift to men. And it is plainly visible, a sacramental thing. To attack "institutional religion" in the supposed interest of pure spirituality may be a natural temptation to certain temperaments; and the sins of those who have spoken in the name of religious institutions have too often excused these attacks. But it is bad logic and bad criticism. It is bad logic, because the abuse of a thing does not remove its use. And it is bad criticism. The idea of an original "pure Gospel," quite unecclesiastical in character, is mythical. Historical criticism can only see the New Testament as the product of a Society conscious of itself, and as permeated throughout by the belief in the real existence and immeasurable value of that Society. And that belief proceeds directly from the words and actions of Jesus, the Messiah and leader of the Messianic community.

For when we look at what happened after the Resurrection, when the Lord who created the Messianic community was taken away, we find a state of affairs entirely consistent with what we have seen to be stated in our records of the work of Jesus on earth. There is the "little flock," gathered round its Apostolic leaders, and receiving at Pentecost the gift of the indwelling Spirit, whereby it became "the fellowship of the Holy Spirit." Its conscious life as a Divine Society, distinct, and one, is revealed in the various phrases of the epistles describing the Church as the household of God, the body of Christ, the pillar and ground of the truth. Those early disciples had no doubt what Christianity meant; it was entrance by baptism into the Kingdom of God's Son and deliverance from the powers of darkness.

The position of the Twelve in the Gospel record is often strangely neglected. Nothing can well be plainer than that one of the main occupations of our Lord's earthly ministry was the selection and training of the Twelve, who were to be the chiefs of the new spiritual Israel. What purpose could there be in choosing *twelve*; in associating them with Himself so closely and training them so anxiously, restricting His public teaching more and more in order to have time to concentrate on the Twelve; in giving them a share in His work? Even if quite arbitrarily we insist on rejecting as later "ecclesiastical" additions the specific texts in which the dignity and the powers of the Twelve are directly ascribed to our Lord's own appoint-

ment in set words, we have still to account for the undoubted historical fact of the Twelve and their large place in our Lord's later life on earth. The eschatological school and the individualist liberal Protestants are alike unable to find any convincing explanation. The radical eschatologist has to explain the Twelve in terms of his theory that Jesus was a deluded visionary who gambled on the immediate end of the world. If that theory were true, Christianity would be an exploded dream, and the less we trouble ourselves with it, the better. The liberal, shrinking from the eschatological theory, and yet unable to endure the thought that Jesus could have been responsible for even the beginnings of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, is left with a great enigma, a historical puzzle at the very heart of the Gospel narrative. I do not think we shall find a satisfactory explanation in any other way than by admitting that our Lord was preparing for the leadership and instruction of a Society when He created the Apostolic band, and that in this visible Society of His followers He saw the actual embodiment of that Kingdom of God which He proclaimed.

If we recognize how intimate is the relation between the two ideas of the Kingdom and the Church, we can justly estimate the difference between them. They are, of course, not absolutely identical. But the attempt to widen the difference between them in the interests of an anti-ecclesiastical conception of New Testament Christianity has frequently abandoned history for propaganda, and misrepresented the real nature of the difference. The Kingdom is wider than the Church, since it existed before the Church was. It extends beyond the limits of mankind and is to be seen in the order of nature. It exists in the heavenly places in an eternal mode. Moreover, the imperfection of the Church (as the parable of the tares shows) implies that not all who are in the Society here will necessarily be of it hereafter; and, since God is not limited by the means He chooses to adopt, we may assume that there are those who, though not of the Body on earth, will not be excluded from the Kingdom hereafter. And the full consummation of the Kingdom awaits the return of the Son of Man. All these distinctions are the commonplaces of Catholic theology. But they ought not to blind us to the truth that the relation between the two ideas is so intimate that for practical human purposes, here and now, and apart from the distinctions of precise theory, they are virtually one wherever we investigate the New Testament conception of them. For the New Testament the visible Kingdom of God, the new Israel, is the Church. The ambiguity of the word "Kingdom," which may mean either "rule," or that sphere within which kingly sovereignty is exercised, presented

no practical difficulty to those who were accustomed to think of God's rule over His Israel. Neither rendering excludes the other: on the contrary, each implies and requires the other. The Lord is the lord of the vineyard.

What, then, is the conclusion? It is, in simple words, that the Church is no mere addition to the Gospel, no mere piece of human machinery devised to preserve a Divine message. The Church is part of the Gospel: and it is a great part. The Church is the organ and earthly nucleus of God's Kingdom. It is in the Church that we are brought to our Heavenly Father. It is in the Church, which is His Body, that we have union with Christ. It is to the Church that we look for the home of the Holy Spirit among men. The men who, a hundred years ago, toiled and suffered for the recovery of the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church were doing the work of the evangel, the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ.

H. BALMFORTH.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

DEAR SIR,

In Mr. Whatton's interesting article in your current number he says that "Cosin seems, *like our own Article* 28" (the italics are mine), "to mistake the significance of the scholastic term 'Substance,' since he says that the substance of the Bread 'appears to our senses,' which, of course, scholastic substance never does or could." This puzzles me, for there is nothing said of "substance" in Article 28, except in the definition of Transubstantiation, which word is explained precisely as it is in the decree of the Council of Trent upon the subject.

I do not think it is strictly true to say that Cosin (as quoted in Tract 27) asserts that substance appears to the senses. His words are that "none will believe" that God turns the substance of bread into some other substance, "as long as it appears to our senses that the substance of the Bread doth still remain whole and entire." This only implies that we commonly infer the presence of a "substance" from sensible appearances; which no one would dispute.

Yours faithfully,
CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

WALNUT TREE HOUSE,
MARSTON, OXFORD.

THE TEXT OF ST. LUKE XXII. 17-20

SIR,

Professor Morris's article, "Jesus and the Eucharist," naturally brings before us the question of the correct text of Luke xxii. 17-20. May I be allowed to state some facts which might seem to prove the genuineness of the Neutral text (here practically the same as the *textus receptus*)? I have never yet seen justice done to them.

(*a*) Luke xxii. 19*a* is contained without exception in every known MS. and version of that Gospel and is quoted by a *catena* of writers from the middle of the second century downwards. If that be not enough to establish the genuineness of any passage in the Gospels, may I ask what would be enough? Indeed there is more evidence against the genuineness of *vv.* 17, 18; for these verses are omitted in the Peshitta.

(*b*) There are certainly six—probably seven—independent patristic witnesses of the fourth, third, and second centuries to the genuineness of the Neutral text of *vv.* 19, 20. (1) Epiphanius (*Panarion*, hæres. xlii. 11, 17, refut. 61); (2) Basil (*Moralia*, xxi. 3); (3) Eusebius of Cæsarea, who in his *Canons* places three separate numbers—265 against *vv.* 17, 18—266 against *v.* 19—and 267 against *v.* 20; (4) Origen, who in his *Commentary on Matthew* (xvii. 33) quotes, as from "the gospel," the expression "cup of the new testament," which is nearer to Luke xxii. 20 than to Matt. xxvi. 28 or Mark xiv. 24; (5) Tertullian (*Adv. Marcionem.* iv. 40); (6) Justin Martyr (1 *Apol.* lxvi. 3); (7) Marcion (on the united and independent witness of Tertullian and Epiphanius).

These testimonies vary in date from Epiphanius and Basil (*c.* A.D. 375) to Justin Martyr (*c.* A.D. 155), and Marcion (*c.* A.D. 140). And each of them represents a MS. as old as the date of the writer and probably older.

They hail likewise from different quarters of the Christian world: Cyprus (Epiphanius); Cappadocia (Basil); Palestine (Eusebius and Origen); Carthage (Tertullian); Rome (Marcion and possibly Justin Martyr, though the latter may possibly represent Ephesus). Their combined evidence makes it practically certain that the Neutral text of the passage in question must have been in existence by the year 100 at the latest; and, if so, it can hardly be anything except genuine.

Let me add that, so far as I am aware, not a single patristic witness has been found to support the Western text.

(*c*) If the Western text had been the original, a scribe who wished to complete what seemed to him defective in the copy before him would have done so from one of the other Gospels—Matthew or Mark—and not have had recourse to 1 Corinthians.

(*d*) The structure of *vv.* 19, 20 is the same throughout. Everywhere 1 Cor. is the main source, but details are taken from Mark. In *v.* 19, "gave to them," and in *v.* 20, "which is poured out for you," are from Mark—not Matthew, in which Gospel these clauses are phrased differently—while the rest is from 1 Cor. with the single exception of the word "given," added to soften St. Paul's harsh construction and to express his meaning more clearly.

If there be any force in this, it shows that the whole of *vv.* 19, 20 is from the same hand and hence must either be accepted *in toto* or rejected *in toto*. But, since the latter is contrary to all the evidence, the former is our only alternative, and a half-way position, like that of Codex Bezæ, is impossible.

Further, this combination of Mark with some other authority is exactly the plan adopted by Luke in compiling his Passion-narrative (see Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 216-7). And it is a plan which no one at a later period would have been likely to adopt, since Matthew almost at once superseded Mark as the favourite Gospel. This seems to be another argument in favour of the genuineness of the verses in question.

(*e*) We can assign an excellent reason for the omission in certain documents of *v.* 20—the desire to avoid what seemed a needless repetition in the mention of two cups. The objection that in such a case the scribe would have omitted *vv.* 17, 18 will not bear examination. There is no sense of repetition until we reach the second occurrence, and accordingly this is the one naturally left out. The scribe would have already copied *vv.* 17, 18, without any feeling of repetition. That feeling would not come to him until he reached *v.* 20, and consequently it would be this which he would be tempted to omit.

There is a striking parallel in the shortened forms of Mattins and Evensong in the Prayer Book. Liturgical history, the analogy of other offices, and the rationale of the service alike show the importance of the second occurrence of the Lord's Prayer and the comparative unimportance of the first. And yet the divines who drew up the shortened forms, and who presumably were far more intelligent than the average Greek scribe, preserved the first and omitted the second merely because it was the second, and hence they were conscious of no repetition until they arrived at it.

No doubt, a first-class theologian like Rabbula, who is believed to be the translator of the Peshitta, would think the matter carefully over and come to the conclusion that, if one cup had to be omitted, it must be the first. But such careful thought is rare in copyists.

(*f*) There remains just one point more to consider—the omission of *v.* 19*b*. This stands on a different footing from that of *v.* 20. For, while in the latter case Codex Bezæ and its Latin allies are strengthened by the adherence of the Old Syriac, in the former the Old Syriac deserts them and joins the vast majority of documents in retaining the words in question. How then are we to account for their omission?

Probably it was not intentional but arose from an accident. The eye of some early scribe chanced to fix itself on a line a little way below the one he was transcribing, and so the intervening portion was omitted. Of all errors in copying this is, and always has been, the commonest. When, as was usually the case, the omission made nonsense of the passage, there was a reasonable likelihood of its being corrected. But when, as in the example before us, this was not so, when the resultant text was quite intelligible—as might easily happen in copying from a MS. written in sense-lines—the mistake was not so likely to be found out and might well remain uncorrected.

This I strongly suspect is the origin of several of the so-called "Western non-interpolations" in the last three chapters of Luke. And my suspicion is confirmed by the number of letters (50) in the Greek of xxii. 19*b*—practically the same as in two other "Western non-interpolations"—xxiii. 34*a* (48, when we make allowance for the sacred Name), and xxiv. 40 (47).

Yours faithfully,
J. W. TYRER.

7, PICKERING ROAD,
NEW BRIGHTON,
CHESHIRE.

THE EUCHARIST AND ST. PAUL

SIR,

"St. Paul," says Professor Morris, "must be acquitted of the charge of creating the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood. But if so, then the notion that 1 Cor. xi. 23 refers to a vision disappears. 'I received of the Lord' must mean 'from the Lord through the Church.' Moreover, the source of St. Paul's information must have been authoritative."

Professor Morris's argument moves here (as elsewhere in his paper) among old and largely artificial dilemmas. But there is a real dilemma in the problem of Eucharistic origins with which he does not come to grips.

However we may be inclined to interpret 1 Cor. xi. 23, there can be no dispute about the meaning of Gal. i. 11, 12. The Gospel which St. Paul preached he had not received from any man, nor been taught it: it came to him "through revelation of Jesus Christ," *and it was the Gospel of the Cross*. The Cross and the Cross only was the basis of St. Paul's universalism: to be crucified with Christ was to be dead to the Law. If this Gospel of the Cross was in fact identical with the original preaching of the Apostles at Jerusalem, it is not conceivable that St. Paul would have made such a claim in respect of it; for we can hardly suppose that the impassioned record of Gal. ii. is concerned to prove nothing more than that the writer's Gospel, though identical with that of *οἱ δοκοῦντες*, was not actually learnt from them. It is true that the primitive apostolic preaching included a "Servant-Christology," and that St. Paul was able to quote as tradition the doctrine that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. But if it is inferred that St. Paul's own Gospel showed

no more than a change of emphasis, it must be allowed that the change of emphasis was of overwhelming significance. Naturally enough it was the consequences of this change and not the change itself that aroused opposition: the Judaisers would have had no ground for attacking St. Paul because of the importance which he attached to the death of Christ, apart from the results to which this led—viz., the abrogating of the Jewish Law. But it is remarkable that neither Professor Morris, nor (so far as I am aware) any of those who feel compelled to minimize St. Paul's part in the development of Eucharistic doctrine, who urge the impossibility of his having made an "innovation" in the Church's Eucharist which has left no traces of opposition, and who would regard the fact of such an innovation as a stumbling-block to orthodox faith in the Sacrament, find it necessary to dispute the far more tremendous change wrought by the same Paul in the sphere of soteriology.

The real question is: If we grant the existence of a specific Pauline soteriology, can we deny the existence of a specific pre-Pauline Eucharist? For the Eucharist in 1 Cor. xi. (and for that matter in 1 Cor. x. also) is saturated in Pauline soteriology. To those Corinthians among whom St. Paul had determined to know nothing save Christ Jesus and him crucified, it is not surprising that the Lord's Supper should have been delivered first and last as a showing forth of the Lord's death. But if there was a time in the earlier days at Jerusalem when the Church did not as yet give this central position in its general teaching to the Cross, is it not difficult to suppose that the Church had always regarded the showing forth of Christ's death as the main function of its supreme act of common worship? And we are not left to supposition.

St. Luke's Gospel, which, as Professor Morris candidly admits, substitutes an eschatological promise for an account of the "Institution," gives us a tradition most easily understood as the outcome of an Eucharistic practice centring not on the death of Christ but on His *Resurrection*. No passage in the New Testament, surely, is more important evidence for what the primitive Eucharist really was, than the story of the two disciples at Emmaus. "He was made known to them in the breaking of the bread." No fact about the Resurrection appearances seems clearer than that they were especially associated with the common meal of the Apostolic circle, at which in fact the Master's absence would come home to them most poignantly, at which another now had to "give thanks" instead of Him. (See, in addition to Luke xxiv. 30, 35, 43, Mark xvi. 14 and John xxi. 12, 13.) When Professor Morris says "We think it incredible that the Eleven ever took part in a fellowship-meal after the Resurrection without recalling the Last Supper," does he not forget that between Resurrection and Ascension there were "fellowship-meals" which the most Real Presence of their risen Master must have stamped far more ineradicably on the Apostles' memory than the Last Supper itself? For were not these suppers, so far from being Professor Morris's "fellowship-meals of a non-mysterious character," themselves the fulfilment of the Master's promise given on that evening of estrangement and shame? Now indeed He was eating and drinking with them in the Kingdom of God. Surely after the Ascension the atmosphere of the Breaking of the Bread must for long have taken its dominant quality from these glorious visions rather than from that saddest of all the times when they had sat at meat with Jesus. If, as Professor Morris rightly urges, it is not possible to argue from the scanty notices in the Acts of the Apostles that the Breaking of

the Bread *lacked* any reference back to the Last Supper, it is impossible to deny that such a passage as Acts ii. 46 suggests the joyful renewal of Resurrection certainty and apocalyptic hope rather than solemn commemoration of Death. And this element St. Paul himself has preserved—it could not have been eliminated—in the "until he come" of 1 Cor. xi. 26. The eschatological motive is still unmistakable in the Eucharistic discourse of the Fourth Gospel (John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54); and finally, the prayers in the Didache and the letters of Ignatius show in a developed form exactly what this tradition leads us to expect—the Eucharist as the pledge of "life and immortality."

What then was St. Paul's real part in the development? Few, certainly, would now maintain the crude idea of a "vision" falsifying history at the base of 1 Cor. xi. The Apostles did indeed recall the mysterious words "This is my Body," and whether or not they recalled also that Jesus had said "This is my Blood," there is no reason to doubt that Jesus on that last night had indeed shown forth His own death to eyes that as yet could not see. The eyes that first were opened were the dazzled eyes of Saul of Tarsus. "Whether in the body or out of the body," he "received from the Lord" the clear perception of what was *implicit* (I use Canon Quick's word—is he a "modernist"?), but implicit only, in the tradition. The Lord had presented Himself as the true Paschal Lamb at the same table at which His followers had received the pledge that they should eat and drink with Him in the Kingdom of God. The pledge had been fulfilled. In the Breaking of the Bread His living presence had been given to the Church, and soon He would be manifest again in glory. Where was the need for a memorial of His death? St. Paul sees the truth at which St. Peter more than once had stumbled. Only if we are conformed to the likeness of His death can we be conformed also to the likeness of His Resurrection.

Professor Morris is "compelled to admit the possibility (not the certainty) that the words 'Do this,' etc., do not go back in exactly this form to Jesus Himself." He is not quite happy about Professor Williams's theory, which makes the eschatological pledge tantamount to an Institution of the Sacrament and presents us *sans phrase* with a full prevision in Our Lord's mind of the developed worship of the Catholic Church. He instances Rendel Harris's "Soma"-conjecture as an example of the "lengths to which opponents of the traditional theory will go." The exegesis of Professor Williams is an example, not less instructive, of the lengths to which its supporters will go. I have tried to show that it is possible to do more justice to the evidence without regarding St. Paul as the "creator of the Sacrament." But I confess to finding it doubtful that even in 1 Corinthians, however "sacramental" St. Paul's thought may be, we can really trace the Sacrament in its crystallized Catholic form. For this form depends on the liturgical use of the Words of Institution, and it seems to me that the language of 1 Cor. x. 16, as well as the whole situation implied by 1 Cor. xi., is more easily understood if the Words of Institution were *not* as yet being regularly used to "consecrate" the Eucharistic elements. I believe that the final liturgical development is more likely to have been reached later, and that it may even be reflected (as radical criticism generally maintains) in St. Mark's account of the Last Supper.

J. BURNABY.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

British Museum Quarterly. Vol. iii., Nos. 3 and 4.

These numbers contain a note on an important addition to the Department of Oriental MSS. This is Part I. of a digest of commentaries on the Babylonian Talmud compiled by Zachariah ben Judah Aghmati. The book was begun A.D. 1189 and completed 1190. It deals with the tractates Berakoth, Shabbath, and Erubhin, and contains extracts from the writings of Maimonides, Rashi, Saadia Gaon, and many others.

An account is given of a tablet of very special interest, found in the excavations at Ur 1926-7, *c.* 2000 B.C. This contains a portion of the conclusion of a Sumerian version of the Gilgamesh epic. The portion preserved on this tablet is parallel to part of Tablet XII in the Assyrian arrangement.

The Museum has recently acquired by purchase a missal of the Use of York dating from the first half of the fifteenth century. The MS. seems to have had an interesting history. The vicissitudes, too, of Church and State have left their mark, including the cancelling of the name and offices of St. Thomas of Canterbury, and the addition of a Mass for the reconciliation of the kingdom to the Roman Church under Philip and Mary.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1933. Heft 1.

The first and principal essay, by W. Staerk, on Habakkuk i. 5-11, is very important. Duhm's theory, that the Chaldæans of *v.* 6 (*Kasdim*) are really Greeks (*Kittim*), attractive though it is, no longer holds the field. But the puzzle remains, that the description is utterly inapplicable to the neo-Babylonian Empire, with its mild and cultured *régime*. Now two important MSS. of the LXX, A and Q, add τοὺς μαχητάς, "the warriors," which may represent an original Hebrew *gibbōrīm*, "the giants," to which "Chaldæans" has been added as an explanatory gloss. The whole prophecy appears in a new and satisfactory light if the writer is using a mythological and eschatological scheme, to which there are many parallels in the other prophets, of the primitive struggle of the Titans with Yahweh and His people. The prophecy is then a "prophetic liturgy" and the last chapter falls into line as an eschatological psalm.

W. F. Lofthouse, in an English article on *Hen* and *Hesed* in the O.T., makes an illuminating remark on the idea of "covenant." To the Hebrew mind "covenant" conveyed no legal idea; it was associated with loyalty on the part of the weaker, loving-kindness on the part of the stronger. The N.T. conception of the covenant must be understood in the light of this background.

J. Kaufmann studies the relation of the prophets to the Pentateuch. Their characteristic ideas are completely lacking and the former critical view, that the Pentateuch as a whole is later than the prophets, must be abandoned.

W. K. L. C.

Zeitschrift für die N.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1933. Heft 1.

From a good number, largely devoted to Pauline theology, I pick out two interesting things. E. von Dobschütz in "Der Historiker und das Neue Testament" makes a very important observation. There is no

need to substitute a dogmatic for a historical exegesis of the N.T. The trouble has been that we have not been historical enough but have read it with too modern eyes. In particular, we have laid stress on what is strange to us. *But just that element was so self-evident to the first readers as to be of quite secondary importance in their eyes.* A truer historical exegesis therefore will find the kernel of the N.T. in what was equally important in both their eyes and ours.

At Stobi in Yugoslavia excavations in an early basilica have revealed an inscription on a pillar which belonged originally to a Jewish synagogue. The text runs: "I, Claudius Tiberius Polycharmus, also called Achurius, father of the Synagogue in Stobi, having lived all my life in Judaism (πολιτευσάμενος πᾶσαν πολιτείαν κατὰ τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμόν, *cf.* Gal. i. 13, 14), for a vow founded the house for the holy places and the triclinium and the atrium out of my own resources. . . ." He retains the upper room for himself and his heirs, who will be responsible for external repairs. Here is the exact analogy of the "house-churches" of the N.T., complete with a triclinium for the common meals.

W. K. L. C.

Analecta Bollandiana, Tomus li. Fasc. i. and ii.

The chief feature of the current number is a long and learned article entitled *Recherches sur la Legendier Romain*, in which among other things the Acts of St. Lawrence are examined. The familiar story that Lawrence, when ordered by the Roman judge to hand over the treasures of the Church, asked for a respite, and then appeared attended by a train of beggars and cripples, saying, "Here are the treasures of the Church," is unhesitatingly rejected by the author, Père Delehaye, the most cautious, not to say sceptical, of hagiologists.

Besides other articles of less interest, there is the usual full list of *Publications Hagiographiques*.

C. P. S. C.

REVIEWS

ETHICS. By Nicolai Hartmann. Translated by Stanton Coit. Vol. I., 12s. 6d.; Vol. II., 16s.; Vol. III., 12s. 6d. George Allen and Unwin.

English readers owe a very deep debt of gratitude to Dr. Stanton Coit for bringing to them this remarkable and impressive study. The thought and style are so essentially German that no translator could possibly make them other than foreign; and the constant recurrence of unfamiliar words such as "categorical," "axiological," and "stratification" imposes a strain on minds trained in a different tradition. But to say this involves no criticism of Dr. Coit, who has done a difficult task well.

It is never easy to assess rightly the work of a contemporary; but there can be little doubt that Hartmann's work is destined to take a high place in the history of ethical study. His first volume—on "Moral Phenomena"—is devoted to an analysis of the facts of the moral consciousness, the meaning of the "ought," and the nature of moral values, together with an examination of some of the main ethical theories of the past. He is concerned to vindicate the complete objectivity of moral values, and in this respect he gives an acute and penetrating criticism of Kant; his own position here is avowedly a return to Plato. He also finds the Kantian system lacking in that it has no concrete ethics of values; it is thus "the exception in the historical succession." Hartmann claims that true ethics must return to the great traditions of antiquity and the Middle Ages of "the old objective apriorism of the ethical 'idea' and the old multiplicity of their contents, the 'virtues.'"

Such is the main task of the second volume, which is the most valuable of the three. After a preliminary discussion of values in life, the author takes up the fundamental moral values, which he finds to be four in number—the Good, the Noble, Richness of Experience, and Purity; and from these he passes to a consideration of "Special Moral Values"—*i.e.*, the Virtues. These he considers in three groups: First, those which were the virtues of Greek antiquity; secondly, those which were the special contribution of Christian thought; and thirdly, a group of virtues brought into prominence by Nietzsche. The whole of this section is worthy of the closest study. There is a most valuable and constructive criticism of the Aristotelian doctrine of the Mean, in which attention to Aristotle's own statement that "from the point of view of Being and of Reason which expressly defines

essence ontologically, virtue is a mean; but from the point of view of the best and of the good generally, it is an extreme." But Hartmann continues the analysis further and shows that behind the doctrine of the Mean lies the truth that each virtue is in reality a synthesis of two values, to each of which one of the "extremes" is opposed. The distinctive contributions of Christianity to ethics are given a full recognition; this is specially noteworthy in the treatment of "purity of heart" and in the completely effective reply to Nietzsche's criticism of "brotherly love."

The chapter on "Personal Love" supplies a lack in most ethical systems. If we accept the Christian conception of love to one's neighbour as a general ethical principle and interpret "neighbour" as widely as our Lord taught us, what is the relationship between that "love" and the particular specialized kinds of "love" towards family or friends? This question is obviously a very urgent one both for theory and practice; for example, Bertrand Russell's discussion of the relative worth of jealousy and "love" in *Marriage and Morals* appears cogent just because it ignores the difference between kinds of "love." Hartmann faces the problem, and his answer really elucidates the subject.

A Christian reader of all these chapters on the virtues must inevitably be testing them as he reads by the consideration how the author's treatment of the question fits in with our belief in the moral perfection of our Lord; all Christian teachers could profitably consider them from this angle, and he would find that the analysis of the virtues not only does not shake his conviction that the life of Christ is the norm of all right living, but that it helps him to see more clearly than before all that is involved in that life.

The third volume is devoted to the consideration of "Moral Freedom." The necessity of freewill in some sense to any real ethics is rightly emphasized, and the nature of freedom is illuminated by the distinction drawn between "negative freedom of choice" and positive freedom; the relation between freedom and causality is also made clearer (though causality itself is not adequately discussed), but this is only done by the acceptance from Kant of what our author calls "the double stratification of the world." "The essential point is that there are in general two layers, two orders of conformity, two kinds of determination in the one world, the world in which man exists, and that both manifest themselves in man himself." This conception recalls the similar theory of the two layers of God's activity, the natural and the supernatural, which enabled the scholastic world to offer an explanation of the miraculous. But in this sphere

many of us cannot be satisfied with the latent dualism, and believe that a rational basis for a belief in miracles must rather be found on the lines of St. Augustine's thought; so here it may be doubted whether a theory of freewill based on an unresolved dualism can be satisfactory.

This leads us to what is, in the last resort, the weak spot in Hartmann's whole outlook. Although he rightly insists on the objective reality of values—itself a metaphysical principle—yet he continually attempts to draw a sharp dividing line between ethics and metaphysics; and this maintenance of the modern conception of the autonomy of different studies leaves a series of dualisms which must be unacceptable to those who hold with the great classical and mediæval thinkers that truth is one. It may be right, it may even be necessary to face apparent antinomies between ontological and axiological, between metaphysics and ethics, between moral freedom and religious freedom at some stages in our investigation of truth; but they can never be accepted as ultimate. Hartmann admirably shows that in regard to freewill the burden of proof rests on the sceptic rather than the believer; but we cannot but feel that a really great book is weakened because he himself is content to take the line of sceptic in the most fundamental matter of all.

PERCY HARTILL.

TWO BOOKS ON MODERNISM

MODERNISM, PAST AND PRESENT. H. L. Stewart. John Murray. 12s.

WHAT IS MODERNISM? H. P. V. Nunn. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

"Professor Stewart has written, in effect, a history of Modernism." Thus the Bishop of Ripon in a foreword. The author defines Modernism as "the effort to restate Christianity with deliberate omission, and at times deliberate denial, of many a tenet that the Church of the past thought indispensable . . . on the express ground that new knowledge, inaccessible to the Church of the past, has proved them wrong," undertaken in the conviction that in this way "the Christian faith is at once brought nearer to its Founder's purpose, and more plainly shown to be the highest attainable truth about the meaning of life." This is sufficiently wide and explicit. It is perhaps a little surprising to learn that the Bishop of Ripon, and others more conservative than he, "could happily stand in with" this definition; and more surprising to read that in spite of this the Bishop is not a Modernist "in the most commonly accepted

sense." It is a pity that his Lordship did not define this latter sense of the term. He would have found it difficult. On the one hand, Professor Stewart's statement would be acclaimed by all who profess to be or are called Modernists: on the other hand, both his definition and his whole story bring all Christian theological thought under the title of Modernism, except such as is but the explication of bibliolatry or of what has been defined by an oracular authority. The truth is that some accept the name Modernist because they think it is imperatively necessary to emphasize that Christian theology is not merely "Traditionalist" or "Fundamentalist"; but it is accepted by only a fraction of those who are convinced that theology must be a living, growing and changing thing; some of these use it to denote disliked opinions of modern individuals which are really so various that they defy classification under one name; and some use it as a term of abuse without caring whether their abuse is directed to any precise address. It is more than doubtful whether such a multiguous term can be used at all by any who care for precision. Professor Stewart's book will increase the terminological confusion.

Defining Modernism as he does, Professor Stewart inevitably makes clear that it is a method rather than a creed. With equal ease he can say that it is to be found in Moslem, Hindu and Buddhist sources, can find examples of it in familiar facts of classical antiquity and, allowing for some differences, among early Christians, particularly in Clement of Alexandria and Origen. He discusses briefly the formation, character and intention of the Creeds. A few sentences serve to show St. Thomas Aquinas as "the patron saint" of Modernists. The story then passes to more modern times. Those who, at the Renaissance, argued for the separation of reason and faith were not in the true succession any more than were some of the Deists of the eighteenth century. In the earlier case "fatuous compromises about 'twofold truth' serve only to intensify that mental discord which Modernism exists to heal": in the other, "a God related to the universe like an absentee landlord to his tenements that are falling into disrepair," a view which resulted from an attempt to mix two incompatible doctrines, corresponded to no moral or intellectual need. The Protestant Reformers were not Modernists: their time was not one suitable for Modernism. But in rendering service such as Modernism could not have done, they indirectly promoted it. For Dr. Stewart, Erasmus is the typical Modernist, but in his day also the different methods of Luther were essential; whereas our age needs an Erasmian reform rather than one after the Lutheran model. He next outlines the story of the beginnings of tolera-

tion, and the rise of rationalism in the Churches of Germany. A brief sketch of Strauss and his opinions is followed by a similar and fuller treatment of the career of Renan. Professor Stewart then passes to a discussion of the impact of the theory of Evolution upon the Biblical world-view, of post-Darwinian Protestantism, and to the well-known story of Roman Catholic Modernism. The book concludes with an enquiry into the present outlook for Modernism, in which the main points are a defence of Modernists against the charge of dishonesty and an exposition of the weaknesses of American Humanism as an alternative.

The book contains nearly 400 pages. Its title professes to deal with Modernism in the present as well as in the past. The reader will not find the intention fulfilled, for, except as noted above, the story stops with the repressive measures of Pope Pius X. In view of the sense in which the author uses the term Modernism, it is very strange that, with the exception of a few casual quotations from Bishop Barnes and Dean Inge, no reference whatever is made to the work or even to the names of any English scholars and thinkers who are popularly accounted Modernists, or to any of the much larger number, whether English or not, who must certainly be included in the company who have made contributions such as the author regards as truly Modernist, or to such a work as *Essays Catholic and Critical*. Serious students of the history of Christian theology will find nothing new in this book, and will probably deem parts of it superficial. But it is well written in a lively style which makes even what is familiar interesting, and it is a very useful volume for the young student and for the general reader.

Mr. H. P. V. Nunn's book is of a different kind and difficult to characterize fairly. It is entirely controversial: his own description is "destructive." It consists of criticisms, unvaryingly hostile, of selected *obiter dicta* of Loisy, Professor Bethune-Baker, Dr. Major and several others, bearing on the subjects of the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, the life of Christ, and the Fourth Gospel. They are introduced by a brief examination of a few definitions of Modernism, in which Mr. Nunn finds those from the Papal decree *Lamentabili* most to his taste, and a final chapter deals with "Some Implications and Consequences of Modernism."

The author recognizes that English Modernists are an "amorphous body," but he offers some justification for his opinion that there is "a certain system of ideas which seems common to them all"; though it is very questionable whether he delineates those ideas with much care. And it is hard to be patient with a writer who says that the ideas are nearly all

derived from Loisy. He never asks whether any of them can be found in English theology long before Strauss or Loisy wrote. He attaches no weight to the clear repudiation of Loisy's opinions in some passages which he actually reproduces; and only a large charity will nullify the suspicion that the Appendix, which is a selection and piecing together of frank and discreditable admissions from Loisy's Memoirs, is free from malice.

It must be admitted that Modernism has not been uniformly fortunate in the attempts of some recent exponents to popularize it. A catena of quite indefensible utterances could easily be collected from the quotations given in Mr. Nunn's work, and not a few of his criticisms are very telling. He is a scholar with a good knowledge of critical literature. He is justified in showing the irrelevance of some of the attempts to account for the origin of the Virgin Birth and Resurrection stories on the supposition that they are not records of fact. But no careful theologian would write of the author of the Gospel and First Epistle of St. John, not only that he makes the truth of his teachings depend on what he had seen and handled of the Word of Life, but that he "further states in the most emphatic terms that the Word had manifested Himself in the flesh under his own observation, and had thus rendered Himself an object of historical investigation and criticism."

It must be said that Mr. Nunn's controversial methods are unpleasant. It is not only that he never hints that any Modernist has written with a desire to be fair to the other side or recognized the strength of arguments for more conservative opinions. He takes two statements from Dr. Inge's essay in *Contentio Veritatis*, in which they appear 29 pages apart. The first is "The doctrine of the Divinity of Christ was, at first, of the nature of a splendid intuition"; the second, "If Christ did not claim to be the Son of God, in a sense that applied to Himself alone, the Gospels are too untrustworthy to have any historical value." Mr. Nunn pronounces these to be "contradictory statements." He ignores that it is the *doctrine* and not the *fact* of Christ's Divinity which is described as an intuition, and also that *in the same short paragraph* it is called "the new revelation." And if a revelation is not intuitively apprehended, how does man ever become aware of it? Mr. Nunn has no right to restrict the meaning of intuition to some occult mode of understanding which is independent of the senses and of ordinary experience.

That Mr. Nunn should write of the "necessity of verifying all references in Modernist books" led me to apply this excellent principle to some of his own in the first fifty pages of his book. On p. 16 Dr. Major is accused of writing as follows: "All other

members of the Church, who have neither the knowledge nor the intellectual honesty to belong to the Modernist party, are set on the other side, and are classed as Traditionalists. They are defined as 'Individuals who can live in the presence of truth, whether new truth or old truth, and be quite uninfluenced by it, *because they have no knowledge of it.*'" What Dr. Major writes is simply, "There are many individuals who can live," etc. The statement is a truism, and is *not* applied to "Traditionalists," still less to all of them. The misrepresentation is repeated on p. 146. Dr. Major is also criticized for saying that "the Traditionalists' refusal to surrender the Virgin Birth does not depend on the historical evidence for it." That statement is open to criticism; but it is a perversion to say (as Mr. Nunn does on p. 34) of words which refer to *refusal to surrender the belief*, that Dr. Major assumed that the faith of his opponents in the truth of the story depends "*not at all upon historical evidence*"; particularly as Mr. Nunn later admits that the view he takes of the story depends ultimately on a view of the nature of God and of His dealings with His creatures.

Again, on p. 45 of his book Mr. Nunn quotes Mr. Emmet's words that "taking the evidence of the New Testament as a whole, the fact of the Virgin Birth cannot be proved from Scripture." Mr. Nunn's comment is: "It is an abuse of language to say that 'it cannot be proved from Scripture' unless the first chapters of the First and Third Gospels are to be regarded as not being part of Scripture." Now Mr. Nunn is fond of italicizing words from the authors whom he quotes, but he omits so to print the words "*as a whole*" as they appear in Mr. Emmet's book; while in the passage referred to, Mr. Emmet calls attention to a later section of his book in which he explains that we must look not at isolated passages but at the New Testament as a whole, and cross-examine the combined evidence. Mr. Nunn's own statement implies that anything can be "proved from Scripture" if it is related therein, which is the Fundamentalist position.

It must further be said that the whole tone of the book is most unfortunate. If Modernists have often erred in this matter, it was unnecessary and regrettable that Mr. Nunn should follow and extend a bad example, to an extent which deprives him of any right to protest. There is the familiar taunt that the Second Gospel is the only one which Modernists treat "as in any sense historical so long as it does not contradict their theories." They are not "as yet" disposed to follow Loisy to his later lengths. They are "undermining the morals of the unhappy generation which is exposed to their influence."

A work in three volumes by several authors "is called, with singular modesty, *The Christian Religion*," and it is "distinguished from all other Modernist books by the admission that it is possible for a 'scholar' to hold the traditional views on the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection." St. Peter was not "even a certain type of University Professor, a man raised by his position, education, and self-conceit to a height from which common and ignorant people were seen at a distance as to be barely perceptible as individuals"; and that persons of this type exist is held to be proved by a shocking remark of Strauss. These are but a few examples of what is characteristic of the book.

A refusal to be satisfied with hazy verbiage or to accept pietistic opining as a substitute for clear and consistent thought, and an appreciation of the best work in New Testament studies by French Roman Catholics, are all qualifications which should enable Mr. Nunn to write books of real use to those who are perplexed by modernism, and which would demand the attention of those whom he attacks. But as it is, he has only himself to thank if people leave his book on one side with the feeling that it were better to be in the wrong with "the critics" than in the right with him.

J. S. BEZZANT.

PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY AND MENTAL HEALTH. By John Rathbone Oliver, M.D., Ph.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932. 8s. 6d.

A MANUAL OF PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY. By Lindsay Dewar, B.D., and Cyril E. Hudson, M.A. Philip Allan. 8s. 6d.

FAITH HEALING: ITS USES AND LIMITATIONS. By A. Clarke Begg, M.D. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

Dr. Oliver's book is a valuable treatise on such mental, moral, and nervous ailments as are likely to come within the ministrations of an ordinary parish priest, written by an author who possesses the unusual and perhaps unique qualification of being at once a medical man, a psychotherapist, an experienced psychiatrist, and a Catholic priest. Intended for the ordinary parish priest, this treatise assumes no professional knowledge in the reader either of medicine or of psychology. Every technical term employed is fully explained. The style is vigorous, lucid, racy, unconventional, and at times even "slangy." Once begun, the book must be read through; and we venture to predict for it that it will prove a "best-seller,"

on both sides of the Atlantic, like the author's earlier *Foursquare*.

No other treatise, known to the reviewer, covers precisely the same ground. The work most comparable with it is the recent volume of Essays by German pastors and physicians entitled *Einführung in die Psychotherapie für Pfarrer*. This book advocates the acquisition by pastors of some degree of psychotherapeutic knowledge as an assistance in their pastoral ministrations, and recommends the close co-operation of physicians and pastors in the treatment of disease—particularly disease of a mental and nervous character.

In certain important respects—particularly in its vivid descriptions of mental and neurotic illness—Dr. Oliver's book outclasses Dr. Neumann's. It is strong throughout on the medical side. On the pastoral side, however, it is less suggestive and helpful; probably because Dr. Oliver, though a priest, has had less pastoral than medical experience. His general attitude towards pastoral problems is quite satisfactory. For example, he insists strongly on the need of accurate diagnosis of the origin and nature of every spiritual malady, and of adequate exploration of the patient's subconscious as well as conscious mind. He fails, however, to give sufficiently detailed directions as to the best methods of conducting these all-important "spiritual interviews," which correspond to the sittings given by psychoanalysts and psychotherapists to their patients. In these interviews the spiritual condition of the pastor's consultants is investigated, the maladies of their souls are accurately diagnosed and traced to their source, and appropriate remedies are devised and applied. At least half of a book of this nature should be devoted to the conduct of the spiritual interview, and to matters connected therewith.

The great merit of Dr. Neumann's book is that it recognizes the importance of the spiritual interview, and shows the pastor precisely how to conduct it. He explains how to overcome the patient's hesitations and reticences; how to elicit from him an intimate and candid life-history; how to explore his subconscious mind (a most necessary operation in all the graver cases); and how to devise and apply the needful spiritual remedies. A fuller treatment of the subject would have improved the book, but the advice actually given is sound and practical.

Every parish priest who desires to minister successfully to the sick in soul will find it necessary to study Dr. Oliver's book, which contains a mass of valuable information nowhere else to be found in an accessible form. On the pastoral side, however, it requires to be supplemented by other works dealing more exhaustively with pastoral psychology.

Two such works can be confidently recommended. One is *Souls in the Making, An Introduction to Pastoral Psychology*, by John G. Mackenzie, B.D., which is probably the best Free Church book on the subject. It deals helpfully with co-operation between physician and pastor, the study of personality and character, "conflict," the resolution of conflicts, "complexes," the difficulties of married life, spiritual interviews, personal dealings, the struggles of adolescence, sexual difficulties, pastoral method and technique. Mr. Mackenzie also deals generally with Christianity as a therapeutic religion, but unfortunately without reference to the therapeutic efficacy of the Sacraments.

Another thoroughly competent work, Anglican in its outlook, is the recent publication of Canon Lindsay Dewar and Mr. Cyril E. Hudson entitled *A Manual of Pastoral Psychology*.

This book opens with "Primary Considerations"—viz., Knowledge of God and Knowledge of Self. The priest is taught to subject his own character and personality to "analysis" with a view to the successful study and analysis of the personalities of his flock. There is a particularly valuable and searching chapter on "clerical failings" which every priest ought to read. The common disease of "vicaritis" is described with acumen and mordant humour. Perhaps the most important chapter in the book is that devoted to "Sin and Moral Disease." It includes such subjects as recidivism, scrupulosity, phobias, pathological lying, kleptomania, and masturbation. It is followed by a long chapter on "Individual Treatment" which, though full of valuable information, is yet to a certain extent disappointing, because its instructions as to the conduct of spiritual interviews are meagre.

In dealing with cases of moral disease, "phobias," "compulsions," and established bad habits, it is essential to trace them back to their remote origins—which are often in infancy or early childhood. The patient, therefore, must be required to furnish an absolutely candid life-history of himself, beginning with his earliest childish memories, and describing in detail the circumstances under which the sin or other infirmity of which he seeks to be cured first manifested itself. Only upon the basis of such a complete disclosure can the priest devise an adequate spiritual regimen and therapy. It is a defect of the book that it does not insist on the necessity of such an autobiography in dealing with complicated or grave spiritual cases.

The last chapter contains much useful advice on preaching and teaching, based on psychological principles which are now generally accepted.

To return, in conclusion, to Dr. Oliver's book, the present writer feels bound to express his regret at the attitude taken up

towards sexual sin, particularly homosexuality, which, without being actually condoned or approved, is palliated to a dangerous extent in numerous passages. There is a particularly unpleasant footnote on this subject on pages 254-255, which might well be eliminated in a future edition. Extravagant expressions of sympathy with homosexuals, and persistent attempts to belittle or excuse their sin, such as this book contains, can only tend to the demoralization of public opinion and to the increase of such vice. Granted that the horror and disgust with which homosexuality is at present regarded by decent people do not always prevent it, yet they certainly do prevent it in innumerable instances, and (what is quite as important) they frequently bring its victims to sincere repentance. If once unnatural vice is allowed to be apologized for, and surrounded with a halo of romantic interest, there is likely to be a swift relapse to the depraved sexual standards of ancient Greece.

Dr. Oliver's attitude towards homosexuality is not only morally objectionable, it is also a mistaken one from the point of view of treatment. He regards genuine homosexuality as innate, and pronounces its treatment hopeless.

Whether any cases of homosexuality are in reality innate is a disputed point among psychologists—the Freudians for the most part deny it. But one thing is perfectly certain, viz., that a large number of homosexual cases which are *apparently* innate can be shown by analysis and other methods of investigation to be the result of "phobias" of the generative organs of the opposite sex, induced in infancy or early childhood by unfortunate sexual shocks. When this happens the sexual *libido*, finding its natural tendency towards the opposite sex thwarted, often directs itself towards the same sex. The painful incident which originated the "phobia" is usually re-pressed and forgotten, so that the homosexual person regards his perversion as innate. In the same way, by the production of a "phobia of the female dog," the Behaviourists have shown that male dogs can be made permanently homosexual.

When a confirmed homosexual comes to a priest for treatment, the first step is to assure him that his infirmity is curable, and to explain the methods by which, in infancy and early childhood, a wrong direction is often given to the sexual *libido*, resulting in homosexualism. A definite hope of cure is thus implanted in the patient's mind, and treatment can begin with a reasonable prospect of success.

And even if, in certain instances, homosexuality really is innate, it does not in the least follow that it is incurable. Orthopædic surgery exists for the very purpose of remedying physical defects which are congenital; and there seems to be no reason

in the nature of things why the well-directed efforts of a skilled spiritual physician should not avail to remedy congenital defects of the *psyche*.

In *Faith Healing, its Uses and Limitations*, by A. Clarke Begg, M.D., the spirit of which is excellent, a medical practitioner pleads for "full and friendly co-operation between Doctor and Priest in a common effort to restore health to body and soul."

The writer, unfortunately, has made no adequate study of the history and *rationale* of the Ministry of Healing in the Christian Church, for which reason his statements on the subject must be received with caution. He regards the effects of Holy Unction as purely spiritual, contrary to the universal tradition of the Church, contrary also to what seems to be the teaching of the leading schools of modern psychology, which for the most part emphasize the organic unity of soul and body, and affirm their mutual influence and interaction. It is true that the effect of Holy Unction is primarily upon the soul and mind of the patient. On the other hand, beneficial physical effects may be expected to follow upon its administration in the great majority of cases.

CHARLES HARRIS.

FROM FAITH TO FAITH. An Autobiography of Religious Development. By W. E. Orchard. Putnam. 7s. 6d.

Although the controversy between Canterbury and Rome has long since settled down into trench warfare, in which neither side can hope for a definite decision, there is always a certain fascination about the path to Rome. And Dr. Orchard's account of his journey covers new ground inasmuch as it reveals the effect of the Roman arguments upon an enquiring and candid Nonconformist. The book is well written, the style is attractive, and if there are some ponderous passages and some unintelligible sentences, these are offset by occasional paragraphs in which the narrative rises to real eloquence. The reader will lay down the book with a conviction that, whether or not the author has justified the Roman claims, he has abundantly vindicated his own courage and sincerity.

Dr. Orchard's career has both interest and variety. Educated in an Anglican elementary school at Rugby, he became connected with a Presbyterian congregation on the removal of his parents to London. Here he received his earliest conscious religious impressions, and here at the age of seventeen he experienced the phenomenon of conversion. Abandoning a clerkship in the old North-Western Railway, he passed to West-

minster College, Cambridge, and in due course was ordained to the ministry of a Presbyterian congregation at Enfield. His earlier pulpit teaching was coloured by Socialism; and eager participation in Mr. Campbell's New Theology brought him to the precipice of Unitarianism. The visible failure of the New Theology engendered a reaction, and a course of George Tyrrell turned his thoughts in a Catholic direction. At the opening of the war he passed to the ministry of the King's Weigh House Congregational Church, and began to fill an empty chapel by preaching pacifism.

With his soul becoming increasingly Catholic, Dr. Orchard gradually began to feel uncomfortable about his isolated position. For a time, under Tyrrell's influence, he toyed with the project of making Modernism a bridge between Protestantism and Catholicism, much in the manner of Newman Smyth. He set up a new system of worship in his chapel, celebrating the Eucharist in a liturgy of his own compilation and maintaining side by side a Zwinglian Lord's Supper. These strange contrarieties were supplemented by the introduction of the English Hymnal and the rite of Benediction. Even so two difficulties remained in his mind. Dissatisfied with the authority of his orders, he privately sought and obtained further ordination at the hands of a schismatic bishop not specified; and wearying of the attempt to set up a single congregation as the norm of Christendom, he began to look out for recognition from some larger religious communion. Rome involved submission; Canterbury, after the Lambeth Conference of 1930, seemed to hold out the prospect of recognition; he made advances, therefore, towards Canterbury.

But the Anglicans were not impressed by the case he put forward; it seemed to involve dangerous implications. No sooner had he explained his position before a committee of Convocation than he was confronted by a pertinent enquiry. Both the question and the answer are significant. "Why do you not go to Rome?" he was asked; and his reply was: "If you cannot help me, that is what *I may have to do*." Rejected by Canterbury, he found himself "steadily and irresistibly turning towards *the only way that was now left open to me*: a final facing of Rome." The end was his submission.

Now there are two Romes. In the first, the devoted children of the Holy Father set forward the arguments for the existence of One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church—visible and divine. In the second, Roman controversialists seek to establish the actually existing Church of Rome, a fragment of its former self, as alone the entirety of the Catholic Church, the sole depository of the promises of God. Dr. Orchard clearly recog-

nizes the existence of the two Romes, and therefore his book divides into two parts: in the first he sets out the familiar arguments for Catholicism; in the second he seeks to explain away the objections raised against Rome from the sixteenth century downwards—exclusiveness, corruption, obscurantism.

In his exposition of the Catholic economy many Anglicans will go with him; but all will part company when he sets out, as many before him, to explain away Romanism. So great is the contrast between the ideal and actuality of Rome that Lord Acton accused an Anglican going over to Rome of making terms with murder. Von Hügel "was even inclined to dissuade any of them from entering the Catholic and Roman Church, so afraid was he of subsequent disillusion" (*Letters*, p. 27). Wilfrid Ward, with his innate candour, has left us a tragic description of the aftermath of Newman's conversion: "His life as a Catholic recalls the device inscribed at the beginning of a Benedictine Prayer Book—the word 'Pax' encircled with a crown of thorns" (*Life of Newman*, vol. i., p. 200).

In these circumstances, with Rome witnessing to the ideal and Canterbury to the actuality, and both of them with drawbacks, we do not expect Dr. Orchard to be able to effect a reconciliation between theory and fact; but we turn to his pages to see in what manner he seeks to escape his difficulties. The result, we frankly confess, is a sense of more than usual disappointment. There is a pitiful absence of the true Catholic spirit. See, for instance, how he sets out on p. 197 to justify Manning's famous, or infamous, saying that "the appeal to history is treachery." "Its principle," writes Dr. Orchard, "is sound, and can be shown to involve nothing outrageous. On many matters of early Church history, for instance, there are strange silences, ambiguous evidence, and documents whose authority is doubtful, but on which no arguments can be built; for tradition can often supplement in a quite trustworthy fashion what literary records fail to provide." Here the phrases "its principle is sound" and "in a quite trustworthy fashion" beg the question; and though we must admit that tradition does sometimes supplement literary records, we are compelled to ask how tradition can *supplement* "what literary records fail to provide."

Nor are Dr. Orchard's other essays in apology more satisfactory. On p. 266 he defends Rome from the charge of discouraging scholarship by pointing to "the vast libraries in Rome" and the permissions given for students to consult every book. Ranke did not find this courtesy—"the freedom of access I could have wished was by no means accorded." Similarly, confusing the ideal and actuality of Roman Catholicism, Dr. Orchard lends himself to the statement that "it is where

Catholicism is accepted and understood that we may expect to see the reasons for war refuted and the causes of war attacked" (p. 290). Have we found confirmation for this vague assertion in the post-renaissance Papacy? Has Dr. Orchard never heard of Julius II., in the critical sixteenth century, clad in shining armour, besieging Mirandola in person? Or of Pius IX. employing a minister of war in the latter half of the nineteenth century? And what of the condemnation, in the famous Syllabus of Errors, of the proposition *Proclamandum est et observandum principium, quod vocant de noninterventu*? And, identifying Catholicism with the Papacy, does Dr. Orchard really believe that "the Catholic religion is now almost the only area where reason is trusted or reverenced"? Is he justified in identifying all non-Roman theologians with the pessimists of the new psychology? And, in any case, what does he mean by "almost"?

On p. 197 Dr. Orchard writes: "I am not so sure as others are that I am a valuable recruit to the Catholic ranks." Every page of his book emphasises this assertion. What he has become convinced of is the philosophy of Catholicism, and not the truth of the Papal claims. And what he wanted was a society which embodied Catholicism. There were two alternatives, Canterbury and Rome. His first inclination was towards Canterbury; when this avenue closed he turned to Rome. Yet it was not the Roman Pope that he saw, but the Roman Church. "If it is once granted that the Church of Christ must be a continuous and united body, then, on historical grounds alone, Rome certainly *has the best claim* to be that body" (p. 179). This is a little hesitating. Even now, when he has admitted the Papal claims, he does not seem fully to have realized their implications. In his Epilogue he states: "Nor is it the validity of my present position that I am most anxious to establish, so much as to find some place where I can have fellowship on the highest subject, with the greatest number." This admission is really incompatible with the exclusive nature of the Papal claims, and lacks the simplicity of Newman's message to Father Dominic: "When you see your friend, will you tell him that I wish him to receive me into the Church of Christ" (*Life*, i. 94).

The Church of Rome, whatever difficulties she presents to those outside her borders and those within, does remain the principal witness to the necessity of visible and objective unity in the Church of God; but in controversy she offers for the acceptance of those outside her a formula which, when the quantities are supplied, fails to solve the equation. It is possible to refuse the formula and remain outside, or to accept it and dis-

cover the equation does not work out. Before unity can be attained Rome must move *from* an old attitude towards truth, and non-Romans must move *towards* a new attitude. Meanwhile, in the Providence of God, both grow together until the harvest. As to Dr. Orchard, we do not feel sure that he has reached a position of finality.

J. L. BEAUMONT JAMES.

NOTICES

THINGS NEW AND OLD. By W. R. Inge, D.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

THE FOOL HATH SAID. By Cyril Alington, D.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 4s. 6d.

MESSAGE FROM A TROUBLED CHURCH TO A WORLD IN TROUBLE. By H. M. Relton, D.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

OUTLINES OF TEACHING SERMONS FOR A SECOND YEAR. Edited by C. E. Hudson, M.A. George Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d. and 2s.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS FOR DAILY LIFE. By A. E. Baker, M.A. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 3s. 6d.

THROUGH THE GRAVE AND GATE OF DEATH. Third and Revised Edition. By John Sinker. Skeffington and Son. 3s. 6d.

NOTES FOR MEDITATION FOR DAILY USE. By W. E. Lutyens, M.A. S.P.C.K. 6s.

The literary columns of the secular press frequently call the public's attention to the increased demand for religious literature today. This imposing list of moderately priced books shows that Anglican apologists are not slow to respond to such a demand. The Church of England, engaged today in a definite "offensive" in her campaign for the faith, is exercising all the literary power at her disposal in an effort to commend that faith to the "thinking layman," who was formerly seldom presented with the case for the Church in a form that was intelligent without being technical.

The first of these books contains the addresses delivered by the Dean of St. Paul's at a mission held at Great St. Mary's early in the year. The reader will find it hard to believe that Dr. Inge could ever have been popularly considered as the embodiment of gloom. Today he is whole-heartedly optimistic in his view of the rising generation and its future. He rightly portrays the Christian religion as remaining for ever the same in essence, yet growing and changing as the thoughts and traditions of successive generations are gathered into the faith and sanctified by it. A religion which has preserved and used, not only the theological genius of Palestine, but also the philosophic genius of Greece and the legal genius of Rome, can likewise assimilate all that is good in the activities and dis-

coveries of modern civilization. The hope of the world lies not in a break with the splendid tradition of the past, but in the preservation of that tradition as the instrument of future progress. Modern theories of the universe are doomed to practical failure and a philosophy of despair, since they lack the unifying theocentric principle which the Christian faith in a transcendent God provides.

While Dr. Inge addresses the university men of today, Dr. Alington addresses the public-school boys of yesterday. He explains that the "fool" whose arguments he meets is not "a person destitute of reason," but the pleasant yet irritating person who constantly lays down the law about things spiritual, though his thoughts on religion are of the shallowest quality. He is, in fact, the Philistine; and Dr. Alington slays his tens of thousands, and conducts a polite but effective crusade from the playing fields of Eton. He attempts in this book no systematic defence of Christianity or of the moderate Anglicanism which he champions. He simply deals with several of the ordinary layman's objections to religion, whether intellectual, practical, or ecclesiastical. And he does this exceedingly well. His apologia for foreign missions is the best modern appeal for their support which has been made to the unecclesiastical layman. We hope that this book will be read by all "fools" who are prepared to be answered according to their folly, and who are still searching for truth and ready to stay for an answer.

Dr. Relton's audience is perhaps a little older than Dr. Inge's and more ready than Dr. Alington's to suffer wise men gladly. They have, perhaps, more acquaintance with the ecclesiastical situation than those to whom the two books already considered are addressed. Yet this book is in some ways the most important of the three. It demands clear thinking on the part of the laity concerning modern controversial questions. And it is certainly the muddled thought of the man in the pew which is largely responsible for the religious misconceptions of the man in the street. The first three sermons in this volume appear to have been delivered at the time of the rejection of the Deposited Book by the House of Commons. They deal with the relations of Church and State and perhaps are already a little out of date. Today the tumult and the shouting have died, and it is clear that the apparently successful attempt of politicians to regulate the Church's worship has in practice proved a failure. The grounds for dissatisfaction with the present position of the Establishment have now shifted, and are concerned largely with the question of State appointment of Bishops. Nevertheless, these sermons remain of interest as an apology for the episcopal policy of 1928, even to those whom their argument fails to convince. And the rest of the sermons in this volume should be read by all who wish to clarify their thoughts as to what should be the Christian attitude to pressing problems of today. The sermon entitled "Prophet, Priest and King" contains the most effective criticism that has yet been made of modern schemes for reunion with bodies which lack an episcopally ordained ministry.

The choice of the ground covered by the second series of *Outlines of Teaching Sermons* is probably explicable to those familiar with the first series. Unfortunately the reviewer is not among their number. While admirable teaching is given on the composition of the Scriptures, on Christological problems, and on ethical principles, the outlines seem to presuppose a more thorough grounding in the Christian faith than even educated congregations possess. It is worth while for the preacher to

remember, as Prebendary Mackay reminded the members of the 1932 Priests' Convention, that what the majority of people want is instruction in the very simplest things. Nevertheless, the parish priest will find these outlines and the appended bibliographies most useful; often a single outline will provide material for a connected course of instruction.

The Christian apologist must be able to present not only a reasoned defence of Christian doctrine, but a positive and attractive picture of its Founder. Mr. Baker states that his aim is to "send readers back to 'search the Scriptures'"; and the reader of this book will certainly return to the Gospels with a clearer conception of our Lord's teaching and a more vivid idea of His Person. Like all Mr. Baker's writings, *The Teaching of Jesus* stands as a strong refutation of the theory that defenders of the faith gain nothing by a study of the achievements of New Testament scholarship.

The Provost of Blackburn expounds the Christian doctrine of immortality to simple people. Probably these addresses in their printed form have lost a certain power which they possessed at the time of their delivery. But their value in a permanent form is evidenced by the fact that this volume is in its third edition.

Apologetics have their limitations. Of necessity they must deal with the doctrines of Christianity from an external standpoint. The apologist can never fully reveal to others the wealth of the content of his religion; he can merely point out the landmarks on the road to the hid treasure. The seeker must tread that road himself. Those who have studied the guide-books of the apologists still need a map of the way; and such a map Canon Lutyens provides in his *Notes for Meditation*. It is impossible to praise this little book too highly. Those who are anxious not only to understand and believe, but to assimilate the truths of historical Christianity, will profit immensely by its use. Considerations are provided to form the basis of daily meditations throughout the year. The author is careful to confine the plentiful material which he provides to suggestions of thought, and this leaves sufficient scope and freedom to those who use his outlines. This book should be a great encouragement to all who desire to practise daily meditation, yet cannot fit their devotion to a rigidly systematic method. The essentially Liberal standpoint of the author enormously enhances the devotional value of the outlines. This book is an essential sequel to be read and used by all who are impressed by the arguments of the books already noticed.

HUMPHRY BEEVOR.

THE JOYOUS CHURCH. By Humphry Beevor. Skeffington. 3s. 6d.

This book, the sub-title of which is "A Defence of Anglo-Catholicism," is a quite excellent piece of work, written with insight and persuasiveness. It is popular in style, but this implies no slovenliness or lack of scholarship. It contains a temperate and well-balanced "apologia" for a Church which avoids both modernism and fundamentalism, and can look history and criticism in the face in a way which is increasingly difficult, if not altogether impossible, for modern Romanism. The difficulties of such a position are obvious, and on a surface judgment some other forms of belief seem to have the advantage; but Mr. Beevor shows that this is largely delusion, and that those who hold fast to the historical Christianity generally held and taught by those who are called Anglo-Catholics need yield to none in

power of meeting the philosophical and theological and other difficulties which beset the enquirer at the present time. The book begins with chapters on the Incarnation as the basic doctrine of Catholicism, and from that doctrine goes on to discuss the Sacraments. Then there follow a statement about Apostolic Order and a discussion on the succession in the English Church, and of the marks of divine blessing which have been granted to it, especially since the revival. The author treats of our attitude towards the old-fashioned Protestantism, on the one hand, based upon theories of scriptural inspiration now no longer possible—there all sympathy and forbearance are called for—and to that sort of modernism, on the other, which reduces the Person of Christ to merely human dimensions, and to that the Catholic must be opposed as a matter of life or death. The two last chapters, entitled respectively "I am bold also" and "I am with you always," show to any who need it to be shown to them how absurd is any "inferiority complex" as regards the English Church as such. Altogether an admirable book.

W. R. V. BRADE.

TREASURE HOUSE OF THE LIVING RELIGIONS. Selections from their Sacred Scriptures. Compiled and edited by Robert Ernest Hume. Charles Scribner's Sons. 12s. 6d.

This is a remarkable compilation, an anthology drawn from the sacred writings of extant historic religions, a veritable storehouse of the religious wisdom of the world since the tenth century before Christ. The labour involved in its production must have been immense: 3,074 passages have been selected from 134 documents which were originally written in sixteen Oriental languages; passages in five of these languages have been examined in their original tongues for the purpose of translation or retranslation.

The material is so clearly arranged and amply indexed that it is a simple matter to find almost at a glance the teaching of a dozen different religions on doctrines which in some form or another are common to all. It will be a useful handbook to the student of comparative religion.

It seems a pity that in making a selection of extracts to illustrate Judaism the compiler did not go outside the Old Testament and Apocrypha. Good use might have been made, *e.g.*, of the *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, the beautiful *Alenu Prayer* (Singer, *Daily Prayer Book*, p. 76), or the *Amidah*, "the Eighteen Benedictions" (Singer, pp. 44-54).

Part IV., *A Programme of Joint Worship*, is a curious compilation of prayers, praises and pious aspirations, collected from the different religions represented in this book, beginning with St. James iv. 1 and closing with the Lord's Prayer. We wonder if it has been already used in some new Temple of Religion in America!

R. D. MIDDLETON.

THE JEWISH BACKGROUND OF CHRISTIANITY. A manual of the political, religious, social and literary life of the Jews from 586 B.C. to A.D. 1. By the Rev. N. Levison. T. and T. Clark. 5s.

The writer has brought together a vast amount of information in a small compass. His Jewish upbringing enables him to speak with an innate authority on the Jewish point of view, and on some New Testament questions; but the reader must be warned against a certain dog-

matism on disputed points—*e.g.*, his dissent from Dr. Oesterley on the early recitation of the eighteen prayers of the *Shemoneh Esre*.

Chapter i., "The Political Aspect," gives the history from the exile to Herod, and the developments are clearly marked. Chapter ii. gives a comprehensive review of the literature, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Mishna and Talmuds. Chapter iii. deals with the religious background of Judaism from the earliest age to the post-exilic, giving Babylonian and Persian influences their right weight. Chapter iv. is on "Feasts, Fasts, and the Sabbath," and is very good on "The Passover"; its evolution and relation to the Last Supper is delineated according to modern views. The last two chapters describe Jewish home-life, social custom, and worship in Temple and Synagogue, Jewish sects and parties, and great personalities like Philo and Hillel.

I think that throughout the book the reader will find himself in rather a different and perhaps a truer atmosphere than in ordinary treatment of the many subjects it includes, and though the writer's views are sometimes open to criticism, they have a right to be considered. There can hardly be any book of the size and price which is so comprehensive and instructive.

W. J. Ferrar.

Supernatural Religion in its Relation to Democracy. By S. C. Carpenter, B.D. Ivor Nicholson and Watson, Ltd. 15s.

"The really remarkable thing about the Epistle to the Romans is not that St. Paul wrote it, but that the Romans read it and were, presumably, able to understand it." "A man, any man who is believed to have the true vocation, appears to have adequate qualifications, and has received appropriate training, may be admitted to the ministry. To what end? In order that he may minister to other men—men as spiritual, as truly members of the Church as he is, but ranked in another order; laymen, not ministers, guests rather than servants at the Lord's Table—that which they need for their life as members of the Body."

These two quotations, one from the beginning and one from the end of his book, give the keynote of the Master of the Temple's presentation of Christianity. It is an institutional religion, ordered so that the grace of God is communicated to mankind through apostles and an apostolic ministry; but this grace elicits the potentialities of goodness to be found in all men, so that supernatural "givenness" is only known through the co-operation of democratic response. This, he argues, has been the nature of Christianity from the beginning. The Gospels give the picture of our Lord as "speaking with authority," but with an authority which establishes its claim by appealing to the understanding of the common people. His ministry was the setting of men free to appropriate what He had come to bring.

This thesis is maintained by evidence drawn from the study of the New Testament, the development of the history of the Church and of Christian theology, the philosophical content of the faith, and the outlook of the twentieth-century mind. The conclusion is that, whether he realizes the fact or not, man needs this supernatural and democratic religion. It is this supernatural and democratic religion which has appeared historically through Christ, has changed the face of the world for the better, has developed a theology which deserves the philosopher's

respect, and can meet the best aspirations of mankind today. Neither a non-democratic supernaturalism nor a naturalistic humanism can substantiate these claims, and what the world needs of the Church is that it should be true to itself.

It is impossible in a short notice to do more than draw attention to the wealth of thought contained in this book. It ranges over an incredibly wide field, but so much care has evidently gone to its planning that the author is master of his material, judiciously selects the illustrations which will make his points clear, and touches little that he does not adorn with illuminating phrases. As a contribution to popular apologetic it lacks, perhaps, incisiveness. But those who are prepared to read slowly, and ponder as they go, will find over and over again that the claims of Christianity come back upon them with a depth of quiet strength that they had not suspected and cannot put out of their minds.

The publishers ought to be ashamed of themselves for putting out a book of this kind without an index.

L. HODGSON.

ORIGINS OF SACRIFICE. By E. O. James. John Murray. 10s. 6d.

In this study in comparative religion Dr. James, of the Folklore Society, has accomplished a notable task, for he has with infinite pains and verification gathered together from all the leading authorities the facts of the "blood rites" as practised by peoples from Palæolithic periods to modern times—*e.g.*, there is the modern stone-age man in the Australian bush whose scarred body is the living witness to the expression in action of his deep-seated belief in giving life to get life more abundantly.

The underlying purpose in Dr. James's examination and analysis of many forms of ritual to which the name "sacrifice" can be applied has been "the hope of discovering the fundamental principles inherent in the institution as a whole, and of determining the chief phases of its expression." Incidentally Dr. James appears also to have the type of mind necessary for visualizing primitive religions in their higher aspects. While he has refrained from attempting to discover a regular cultural sequence from ancient to modern sacrificial rites, he has certainly succeeded in showing that, running like recognizable threads through the pattern of the ages, there are manifestations of an emotional ritual having as its motive the setting up of an active relationship between a human being and a supernatural being; by which an exchange of the life-principle is sought for bringing about some desired benefit, sometimes to the "god" in order that he may in turn be strong to revivify the sources of human food.

A most illuminating, but horrifying, example of such a ritual is given in chapter iii.; there is a description of a solar theology which gave rise amongst the Aztecs of the fourteenth century to a ritual which included the daily sacrifice of a man who, stripped of his ornaments, was stretched over the convex sacrificial stones; while five priests held his arms, legs and head, the high priest, or sacrificer, cut open his breast with a flint knife and tore out the heart. This was held up to the sun to provide it with nourishment before it was cast into a bowl of copal placed in a position to enable the blood and incense to ascend to the gods. Sometimes a solemn feast was then held on the flesh, the skin having first been removed, to be worn ceremonially by men who seem to have acquired

thereby the fertilizing and health-giving qualities of the victim. Behind all the ghastly sequence of these solar rites lay the belief that at all costs the life-giver must be sustained. Unwilling, however, to make toll on their own people, aggressive wars were waged to furnish the altars.

In Chapter IV. the theme develops into a comparison of the solar ritual with that of head-hunting and cannibalism. Among the Dravidian, African, and Burmese tribes the natives regarded the head as the seat of the "soul substance," and the captured head was employed to aid the growth of crops. Ritual eating of the head appears as a later development, the desire being to profit by the soul-substance of the victim or for revenge upon an enemy to deprive him of after-life.

Out of very primitive ideas concerning the blood or soul relationship of gods and men grew the more complex ideas of propitiation, substitution and atonement. Chapter vii. includes an examination of the Hebrew Paschal Blood ritual. In its earliest form it appears to have been connected with the offering of first-born children, with, later, the substitution of an animal victim, and with a stronger motive of propitiation for "sin," so that the daily cry of the Sumerian penitent was, "I know not the sin which I have done"; but so far the sin only signified ritual non-observance.

Chapter IX. traces out the effect of the Exile and of the rebuilding of the temple on the Hebrew ritual of sacrifice. The Exile gave the new conception of the transcendental holiness of God, and with the renewal of the sacrificial ritual the blood symbol now pictures forth the "broken and contrite heart."

Chapter VII., "Sacrament and Sacrifice in Christianity," examines Jewish Baptism, Essenism, Judaism, Paulinized Christianity, Origins of the Eucharist, the Agape, and finishes with a masterly analysis of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament and its liturgical development into the Eucharistic drama, culminating in the daily mass of the mediæval Church as the central and most solemn rite of Christian worship, taking its place in the institution of sacrifice as a complex ritual pattern representing certain situations connected with the promotion and conservation of life.

These few extracts from Dr. James's brilliant thesis may serve to induce others to traverse the whole field with him in his search into the origins of sacrifice, a fascinating and inspiring theme.

We hope the author may speedily see his way clear to publish a cheaper edition, which, with the foreign references omitted or translated, and the more technical archæological parts simplified, would bring the main argument within the reach of less learned people who are interested in the history of their own religion. How few even of our university graduates have had the benefit of studying comparative religion, probably the most unifying of all studies.

We may yet hope that the new generation, which is ever ready to act as the victim for the new form of blood ritual, namely, blood transfusion, may regain the old love of mediæval times for participation in the "Daily Sacrifice," as pictured in Dr. James' pages in all its pomp and splendour, in all its tender beauty, as the rallying-point for giving life to get life.

EDITH JONES.

THE THRESHOLD OF ETHICS. By Kenneth E. Kirk, D.D. Skeffington. 3s. 6d.

This admirable little book deliberately avoids confusing the reader by discussing the problems which fascinate academic moral philosophers. It may, therefore, be in danger of giving a false impression of simplicity. But this is a risk which must be taken whenever an author wishes to write a "Threshold" book, and Dr. Kirk is well entitled to state his conclusions and to omit such parts of his preliminary approach to them as would only appeal to specialists. He begins by a careful statement of what "conscience" and "ethics" mean, and then goes on to meet and rebut the widespread notion that psychology and evolutionary science have rendered them obsolete. This lesson is driven home by a brilliant criticism of Lippmann's *Preface to Morals*, which shows that it only achieves its end by unconsciously relying on the "obsolete" ideas, and the ground is thus cleared for Dr. Kirk's fuller statement of his own position, with its recognition of the distinction between the objective rightness of actions and the subjective praiseworthiness of motives.

In the last chapter a fresh problem is raised, arising out of the contrast between the "conscientious" life on the one hand, and the "virtuous" or "saintly" life on the other. The latter is the expression of the love of goodness, and is free from the moral struggle involved in the former. The cultivation of conscientiousness is psychologically and spiritually undesirable, but how can a man pass from conscientiousness to virtue or sanctity? He cannot by any effort of his own. The transformation can only be made through the spirit of worship; and thus it is that the Christian religion can solve the ultimate problem of practical ethics. In this chapter, more than elsewhere, one feels that Dr. Kirk's treatment is too brief to be satisfying. While I think I understand his main thesis, and appreciate the force of his contention, I have a doubt whether the mutual exclusiveness of conscientiousness and virtue has not been exaggerated. I should like to ask Dr. Kirk whether he would deny the description "conscientious" to the human life of Christ, and how on the basis of his scheme of things he would interpret St. Paul's saying that "even Christ pleased not Himself," or the language in the Epistle to the Hebrews about our Lord being "in all points tempted like as we are"?

On p. 99 there seem to be two slips in the analysis of Lippmann's book. Lippmann may be inconsistent, but if in one mood he regards the moral distinction between right and wrong as a "stubborn fact of life," the inconsistency does not lie precisely where Dr. Kirk suggests. And in his paraphrase of the sentence "ideals are an imaginative understanding of that which is desirable in that which is possible," Dr. Kirk has exactly inverted its meaning.

It would be interesting to know the authority on which Dr. Kirk on p. 157 ascribes to Richard Baxter the saying more commonly attributed to John Bradford.

L. HODGSON.

THE HOLY GHOST: THE COMFORTER. A study of the Nature and Work of God the Holy Spirit. By the Rev. Peter Green. Longmans. Cloth, 4s. 6d.; paper, 3s.

Canon Peter Green writes this little book out of a conviction that the greatest need of the world to-day is a revival of a really spiritual religion.

But as far as our Communion is concerned, how is such a revival to come about? Canon Green suggests a more extensive use of parochial missions, and of clear and intelligent teaching—about the Sacraments, about the duty of worship, about sanctification as the will of God for every man. He has some useful words of counsel on all these matters, and much to say that will be of value to both clergy and layfolk. The truth of the matter seems to be that even after 100 years of revived spiritual life a large part of our Church is in a state of spiritual slumber. The key to the situation lies in the hands of the clergy. Do we sufficiently instruct our people in the ways of the Spirit? Do we show them how they can live the spiritual life? Are we training the young? Have we a real love for souls? Are we careful students of ascetical theology and trying ourselves to live a life of prayer? A golden opportunity came with the Way of Renewal, which has become unfortunately little more than a series of study circles, valuable in their way, but quite unlikely to lead to a revival of spiritual life.

We feel doubtful about some of Canon Green's sacramental teaching —the ideas, *e.g.*, expressed on p. 104 (note) seem to lead to the slippery slope that ends in non-sacramentalism. We do not think that the contents of this excellent little book quite justify its title.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

LAWN SLEEVES. A Short Life of Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford. By J. C. Hardwick, B.Sc. Basil Blackwell. 5s.

Why do Modernists always display a fervent attachment to the slightly out-of-date? Mr. Hardwick is no exception. At a time when the Lytton Strachey type of biography is becoming old-fashioned he selects that model for his life of Bishop Wilberforce. As we should expect from its author, the work has considerable intellectual ability. It displays more sympathy with its subject than we should perhaps expect. It may be argued that when we are being flooded with books commending the Oxford Movement, it is a good thing to hear the other side. But on the whole we do not think that this manner of approach forwards the cause of either truth or religion. In his chapter on "Cuddesdon Squalls" it is interesting to observe the only alternative to the alleged pious "attitudinizing" that the author is able to suggest. "If" the young men "had not been on their knees in the chapel, they would probably have had girls perched upon them as they sat drinking beer in the public-house." Does this dilemma represent the wish to be smart or the author's theological college experience?

E. J. BICKNELL.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER